

Estaban Fonseca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6626. A bill for the relief of Peter (also known as Petrus) Appelboom and Petronella K. Appelboom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 6627. A bill for the relief of Dr. George Petkov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 6628. A bill for the relief of Thomas James Nemsoko Dupigny Leigh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 6629. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nellie White Houck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 6630. A bill for the relief of Arthur Sew Sang, Kee Yin Sew Wong, Sew Ing Lin, Sew Ing Quay, and Sew Ing You; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 6631. A bill for the relief of Alexander Turchaninova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 6632. A bill for the relief of Lee Bing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER (by request):

H. R. 6633. A bill for the relief of Maximilian Rubin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 6634. A bill for the relief of Lieselotte Boehme; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 6635. A bill for the relief of Joseph Desson, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 6636. A bill for the relief of Gregory Harry Bezenar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH (by request):

H. R. 6637. A bill for the relief of Felice Marotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 6638. A bill for the relief of Ah Tsair Ying, also known as Ah Tsair Yung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6639. A bill for the relief of Nino Bertini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 6640. A bill for the relief of Michele Giordano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 6641. A bill for the relief of Maggie Jane Hanlon Magoffin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 6642. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Augusta Selmer-Andersen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 6643. A bill for the relief of Manuel Lopez Avila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 6644. A bill for the relief of Rangila Miah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 6645. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agavni Balantzian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 6646. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elsa O'Neil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 6647. A bill for the relief of Yoko Kagawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

403. By Mr. STAGGERS: Petition of Rev. Fred Bowman and 42 other citizens of Keyser, W. Va.; Rev. Norman Harsh and 35 other

citizens of New Creek, W. Va., and nearby communities; Carl Moreland and 25 other citizens of Ridgeley, W. Va., and nearby communities; urging the enactment of H. R. 1227, to prohibit all liquor advertising through interstate commerce and over the radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

404. Also, petition of Melvin Slaubaugh and 33 other citizens of Kingwood, W. Va.; C. C. Moyers and 46 other citizens of Brandonville, W. Va.; and Jeremiah Everly and 21 other citizens of Bruceton Mills, W. Va., and nearby communities; urging the enactment of H. R. 1227, to prohibit all liquor advertising through interstate commerce and over the radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

405. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Santos Gaud Rodriguez, Santurce, P. R., relative to illegal retirement on CSA 247873, in San Juan, P. R.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 30, 1953

(Legislative day of Monday, July 27, 1953)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, as morning rises to noontide, we pause in the heat and burden of the day for this moment of refreshment when we stand before Thee. May we find power to confirm our faith, to renew our hope, and to increase our love. Keep our souls alive with vision, our minds alert with wisdom, and our hearts aglow with goodness.

May the precious hours of this passing day be filled with the intensity of living, that, as evening comes, we may look back with the benediction of accomplishment upon us, knowing we have done what we could. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 29, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 2249. An act to enable the President, during the period ending March 15, 1954, to furnish to peoples friendly to the United States emergency assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements; and

S. 2315. An act to authorize payment of certain war claims.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 62. An act to amend section 3178 of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 304. An act to provide for the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital, in the District of Columbia, of certain citizens of the United States adjudged insane in foreign countries;

H. R. 6354. A bill to authorize the Coast Guard to accept, operate, and maintain a certain defense housing facility at Cape May, N. J.; and

H. R. 6465. An act to amend paragraph 1530 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to footwear.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call, there may be the customary morning hour for the purpose of allowing Senators to introduce bills and joint resolutions, to make insertions in the RECORD, and to transact other routine business, with the usual limitation on speeches of 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for action on nominations under the heading "New Reports."

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

NOMINATION OF GEORGE COCHRAN DOUB, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, DISTRICT OF MARYLAND—EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, it is a great privilege and pleasure for me to report the nomination of George Cochran Doub, of Baltimore County, Md., to be United States attorney for the district of Maryland. The nomination was unanimously approved by the Judiciary Committee this morning.

Mr. Doub has been a lifelong friend, a classmate in law school. He is an extremely able man, one of the leaders of the Maryland bar. He is a man of the

highest integrity. He possesses the highest sense of justice. He is a man who, in the truest sense of the word, is a good and public-spirited citizen willing to make the sacrifice necessary to perform the public service he has undertaken.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I report favorably the nominations of Charles J. Bowie, to be postmaster at Oakley, Kans.; Wilbert L. Randall, to be postmaster at Newburyport, Mass.; Alpheus M. Lewis, to be postmaster at Somerville, N. J.; Clarence W. Lambert, to be postmaster at West Warwick, R. I.; George W. Lampert, to be postmaster at Rapid City, S. Dak.; and Sandy A. Tommeraasen, to be postmaster at Madison, S. Dak.

This is not only an unusual, but an especial, occasion for me.

I was elected to Congress in 1934 and served 12 years in the House of Representatives. I was elected to fill out a vacancy in the Senate in the 81st Congress and have served continuously since, and this is the first opportunity I have had to present for confirmation the nomination of a postmaster from my own State. During my service in the House of Representatives I had no opportunity to recommend a postmaster, because our party was not in power.

It is particularly gratifying that the appointment of Charles J. Bowie, to be postmaster at Oakley, Kans., should be from the congressional district from which I had the privilege of serving so many years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Reports" will be stated.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James W. Riddleberger, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Yugoslavia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD—PHILIP RAY RODGERS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Philip Ray Rodgers, of Maryland, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey subsequently said: Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare it is a special pleasure

for me to be able to endorse the nomination of Philip Ray Rodgers to be a member of the NLRB.

I have known Ray Rodgers since 1947 when he became chief clerk of the Labor Committee. Since that time I have had the opportunity to work closely with him and have come to know his abilities.

I have great respect for Mr. Rodgers' capabilities in the field of labor relations. A mere recitation of his educational background and experience is in itself impressive.

He was graduated magna cum laude from the University of Utah in 1939 with a joint major in history and political science.

He received a master of science degree in public administration from the same university in 1940.

He was awarded Stanford University's Henry Sewell scholarship for the year 1940-41.

In 1947 he received a doctor of philosophy in public administration from American University here in Washington.

A year later, in 1948, he received his bachelor of laws from George Washington University.

Ray Rodgers began his career as secretary to the late James J. "Puddler Jim"—Davis, of Pennsylvania. He worked for Senator Davis from 1942 to 1945. From 1945 to 1947 he became assistant professor of political science and public administration at American University. In 1947 during the 80th Congress he became chief clerk of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. He stayed on with the committee as minority clerk during the 81st and 82d Congresses. At the beginning of this, the 83d Congress, he became staff director of the committee. Since 1948 he has also served as adjunct professor of political science and public administration at American University. He is a member of the bar of the District of Columbia.

Thus we see that Mr. Rodgers has an unusually well-balanced experience in both the academic and governmental fields. His knowledge of labor law is supplemented by a unique personal experience in the developing of congressional legislation in that field. He will bring to his new job a first-hand knowledge and understanding of congressional thinking in the area of legislation and the intent of Congress in framing the Taft-Hartley Act and its amendments. Such a background as this will be invaluable to him as a member of the Board.

In addition, Mr. Rodgers has certain personal characteristics which I feel will make him particularly effective in his new position. He is noted for his forthrightness, frankness, and honesty. I have frequently heard it said by those who hold different political views that they could work well with him because they could trust him and always knew where he stood.

Mr. President, I feel that we are extremely fortunate in having such an able candidate to fill this vacancy on the NLRB. I am particularly gratified that our committee votes unanimously and by acclaim to report his name favorably to the Senate.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edwin R. Price, of Kentucky, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, before the nomination of Mr. Price is confirmed, I wish to make an observation. It was not my privilege to attend the hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. Price is a member of my political faith, from our State. No more outstanding representative of management could have been found in the coal industry in Kentucky than Jack Price. While I was Governor of Kentucky, I used him in many capacities. Today he is a member of the board of regents of one of our schools, an appointment which I made, and which has been renewed by the present governor.

I desire to commend the President and those who advised him upon the selection of Jack Price for this position.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles R. Ferguson, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles Sparks Thomas, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Donald Aubrey Quarles, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

REGULAR AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Wilbert Harding McElvain, to be a captain in the Medical Corps, Regular Air Force.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nominations.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPEAL OF FEE-STAMP REQUIREMENT IN FOREIGN SERVICE AND AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1728, REVISED STATUTES

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the fee-stamp requirement in the Foreign Service and amend section 1728 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON PLAN OF IMPROVEMENT FOR WASHITA RIVER SUBBASIN, RED RIVER BASIN, OKLA. AND TEX.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on a plan of improvement for Washita River Subbasin, Red River Basin, Okla. and Tex. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman and members of the Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 14th semiannual report of that Commission, dated July 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITION

A petition was laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts, and Letters, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide increased appropriations for the National Science Foundation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES TO COMMEMORATE TERCENTENNIAL OF FOUNDATION OF NEW YORK CITY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 2474) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the tercentennial of the foundation of the city of New York, and I submit a report (No. 724) thereon.

The committee is fully aware that the Treasury Department for a number of years has consistently objected to the enactment of legislation authorizing the issuance of commemorative coins, and while recognizing that there is much to be said for the objections which are raised to the policy of authorizing commemorative coins, it is your committee's considered judgment, that exceptions should be made to the general policy when the event to be celebrated is, in the opinion of the Congress, of such magnitude and of such historical importance in the life of our country and its institutions that it deems the event should be commemorated.

The possible small additional cost to the United States in the issuance of the commemorative coin which this bill authorizes and which from time to time the Congress may authorize is, in your committee's opinion, far outweighed by the benefits that redound to us as a people and a Nation. Our history, our traditions, our institutions, are historic benchmarks in the development of the Nation and their commemoration is symbolic of the spiritual and political development of the Nation, and they help, as does our flag, to instill in the minds of our people that patriotic and spiritual fervor, without which we as a Nation cannot survive. We must be just as vigilant—in fact, more vigilant—about maintaining and encouraging the spiritual resources of the Nation as we are about the preservation and development of our physical and economic resources. The material resources of a nation can be dissipated or destroyed; the spirit, tradition, and sacred history of a nation, if reasonably protected and developed, will not only never die, but will serve also to make it strong physically and economically.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS AND INTERIM REPORT ENTITLED "SUBVERSIVE INFLUENCE IN EDUCATIONAL PROC-ESS"

Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 47), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary not to exceed 25,000 copies of parts 1 to 13, inclusive, of the hearings and the interim report, dated July 17, 1953,

entitled "Subversive Influence in the Educational Process," held before a subcommittee of the above committee during the 82d and 83d Congress.

PRINTING OF PART OF HEARING AND REPORTS OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY ON INTERLOCKING SUBVERSION IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Mr. JENNER submitted an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 48), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary not to exceed 25,000 copies of parts 1 to 14, inclusive, of the hearings and the interim report entitled "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments," held before a subcommittee of above committee during the 83d Congress.

REPORT ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, the following report was received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JULY 1, 1953.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1953, to June 30, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES		
Paul E. Kamerick, staff director.....	\$11,646.00	\$5,823.00
William V. Sinnott, agent.....	10,068.45	5,034.18
Ira E. Gunn, Jr., assistant staff director (to Mar. 15).....	9,404.83	1,959.32
Leo C. Nulty, agent.....	9,653.69	4,826.82
John M. Laxalt, agent (to Mar. 15).....	5,812.63	1,210.92
Joseph F. McDonald, Jr., agent.....	8,644.09	4,322.04
Daniel W. Sullivan, fiscal officer (to Mar. 15).....	8,644.09	1,800.85
Paul A. Toussaint, agent.....	8,461.59	4,230.78
Mary Ellen Hutchison, clerical assistant (to Jan. 15).....	5,238.97	218.29
Angela M. Novello, clerical assistant.....	4,378.64	2,268.94
Dorothy L. Sankey, clerical assistant.....	4,569.81	2,412.32
Jessie E. Stearns, research assistant (to Mar. 15).....	5,047.77	1,051.60
John W. Wedge, Jr., clerical assistant (to Mar. 15).....	4,761.00	991.87
Louise L. Morgan, clerical assistant (from Apr. 15 to May 11).....	3,996.26	290.71
Alice S. Dearborn, clerical assistant (from June 15).....	3,996.26	177.61
Bernard S. VanKenselaer, agent (from Mar. 4).....	10,068.45	3,272.22
Paul J. Tierney, agent (from Mar. 19).....	10,068.45	2,852.70
Eliot U. Wyman, counsel (from Mar. 20).....	11,646.00	3,267.35
James E. McVea, agent (from Mar. 24).....	9,073.03	2,444.65
Leonard E. Edwards, agent (from Apr. 20).....	10,068.45	1,985.70
Marion G. Robertson, investigator (from June 9).....	6,003.71	366.89

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1953.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

TO THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report on miscellaneous expenses for the period from January 1, 1953, to June 30, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Miscellaneous expenses

Unexpended balance of amount authorized by S. Res. 129, June 26, 1947, as of Jan. 1, 1953-----	\$24,151.49
Amount expended Jan. 1 to June 30, 1953-----	0

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1953-----	24,151.49
---------------------------------------------	-----------

82d Congress:

Unexpended balance of amount authorized by Reorganization Act and S. Res. 162, 204, and 335 as of Jan. 1, 1953-----	\$3,744.48
Amount expended, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1953-----	548.66

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1953-----	3,195.82
---------------------------------------------	----------

Unexpended balance of funds authorized by Legislative Appropriation Act, 1952, as of Jan. 1, 1953-----	34,354.42
Amount expended, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1953-----	132.93

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1953-----	34,221.49
---------------------------------------------	-----------

83d Congress:

Unexpended balance of amount authorized by Legislative Appropriation Act, 1953, and Public Law 547, approved July 15, 1952-----	345,383.28
Amount expended, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1953-----	54,347.43

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1953-----	291,035.85
---------------------------------------------	------------

Amount authorized by Reorganization Act and S. Res. 121-----	20,000.00
Amount expended, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1953-----	2,882.26

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1953-----	17,117.74
---------------------------------------------	-----------

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FOTTER:

S. 2522. A bill for the relief of Dumitru Iordache; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 2523. A bill for the relief of Remzi Gurcay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 2524. A bill for the relief of Dora Papara and Ethel Stathis Papara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 2525. A bill for the relief of Lupe M. Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 2526. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to relieve innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 2527. A bill to extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2528. A bill for the relief of Dr. Edward V. Sittler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 2529. A bill for the relief of the estate of E. S. Babcock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2530. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide unemployment insurance for Federal civilian employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 2531. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Konstantinos Thanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 2532. A bill for the relief of Giuseppina Latina Mozzicato and Giovanni Mozzicato (John Mozzicato); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 2533. A bill to provide a lump-sum death payment to beneficiaries of employees of the Forest Service killed while combating forest fires; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2534. A bill for the relief of Dora Vida Lyew Seixas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 2535. A bill for the relief of Rufca Tweig; and

S. 2536. A bill for the relief of Ellen Henriette Buch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. PASTORE):

S. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution to increase the minimum wage rate provision of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT, RELATING TO INCREASING THE MINIMUM WAGE RATE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to increase the national minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act from 75 cents to \$1 an hour.

I realize that other revisions in the act are necessary, but I am hopeful that the Congress will see fit to act during its next session upon this single step. Of course,

no action can be taken during this session; but I feel that the introduction of such a measure is important in order to prepare for early action next year.

In my opinion, a national minimum of \$1 an hour is thoroughly justified and is certainly not excessive in view of rising living standards and living costs. One dollar an hour, or \$40 a week, does not provide a family with the minimum budget required in any part of the country under present prices, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. A minimum wage based upon increases in cost of living and worker productivity since the establishment of the 1938 or 1949 minimums would be in excess of \$1 an hour. Moreover, since the minimum wage of 40 cents an hour was provided for by Congress in 1938, average gross hourly wages of manufacturing production workers have risen 179 percent and per capita income has risen 197 percent. An increase in the minimum wage corresponding to these increases would require a minimum of nearly \$1.20 an hour. A comparison with increases in these factors since 1949 also supports a minimum of not less than \$1 an hour in 1953.

As pointed out by several recent studies, a more realistic floor beneath wages would be an important factor in preventing undesirable industrial dislocation and unfair competition, as well as exploitation of low-wage employees; would boost purchasing power, living standards and productivity, and would be particularly important as a stabilizing factor in these days when economists talk darkly of a mild recession. The most recent nationwide data on wage rates issued by the Department of Labor demonstrates that such an increase could be easily absorbed by all covered employers in interstate commerce, and experience with the 1938 act and 1949 amendments amply disproves the usual claims that such legislation would cause mass unemployment, discriminate against small business, or cause price increases. On the contrary, a minimum wage of \$1 an hour would protect the incomes of small-business men and employees in all parts of the country from the unfair competition of submarginal wage rates. This can by no means eliminate wage differentials, but would reduce the unfair advantages over legitimate manufacturers which are now gained by those exploiting the helplessness of their employees under sweatshop conditions.

Such a measure is clearly in keeping with President Eisenhower's campaign pledge of a high level of wages with steady purchasing power and the platforms of both the Republican and Democratic Parties. Average hourly earnings in manufacturing today are at a high level—over \$1.75 an hour—and this indicates the ease with which our increasingly productive and expanding economy can adjust to higher minimum wage standards. But the present high average cannot be maintained by all workers when they face competition from those workers in interstate commerce who receive less than one-half the national average, or when we enter the postwar mobilization period without the

adequate and effective wage floor necessary to continue a high level of purchasing power and living standards.

I am hopeful that Congress during its next session will take early action upon this measure so necessary to the economic well-being of the Nation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 107) to increase the minimum-wage-rate provision of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6281) to reimburse the Post Office Department for the transmission of official Government-mail matter, heretofore received, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADDITIONAL HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 62. An act to amend section 3178 of the Internal Revenue Code; and

H. R. 6465. An act to amend paragraph 1530 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to footwear; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 304. An act to provide for the admission to Saint Elizabeths Hospital, in the District of Columbia, of certain citizens of the United States adjudged insane in foreign countries; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Resolution by Bexar County Pomona Grange, Texas, relative to reciprocal trade.
Editorial entitled "Texas Must Conserve Water Against Dry Seasons That Will Come Again," published in the *Paris, Tex., News* of July 21, 1953.

Article entitled "The Biggest Inch," written by Curtis Bishop, and published in the magazine *Texas Parade* for July 1953.

By Mr. BEALL:

Sermon preached by Father Brown at the silver jubilee mass of Father Thorning, pastor of St. Josephs Church, Carrollton Manor, Md., associate editor of *World Affairs* and advisory editor of the *Americas*.

RECOMMENDATION FOR COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN TO MEET IN ADVANCE ON SECOND SESSION AGENDA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement regarding the agenda for the second session of the 83d Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

I wish to make a suggestion on legislative procedure to which I have given a good deal of thought. I feel humbly but firmly that this suggestion could be most helpful to the future of the Congress and of our country.

My suggestion is that several weeks before the next session of the 83d Congress convenes that the Senate's committee chairmen meet, together with the Republican Policy Committee, to plan on the next session's agenda and timetable.

WE SHOULD AVOID LAST-MINUTE LOGJAMS

I believe that such meeting could help to prevent the inevitable last-minute logjams such as we are now experiencing. It could help make sure that practically from the start of the next session, Senate committees could be speedily processing the tremendous avalanche of bills which lie before us.

I believe that this same approach—assembling a committee of committee chairmen—could well be followed by those of my colleagues who serve on the House of Representatives side, although that is, of course, for them to determine.

Ordinarily, I would not make a suggestion in this particular field, because this issue is basically within the province of the majority policy committee itself and our very competent acting majority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND]. The members of our Policy Committee have done, I believe, a very creditable job. But I believe that their job can be improved upon with the cooperation of Senate committee chairmen.

Already, there are several such chairmen serving on the policy committee. But since the policy committee must inevitably hear from still other committee chairmen with regard to individual committee plans, I believe that assembling the committee chairmen with the policy committee would serve as a very sound and practical procedure.

Woodrow Wilson, many years ago, described the United States Government as "a Government by chairmen of standing committees."

The chairmen of the committees are in positions of great significance. But one of the reasons why, unfortunately, the Congress—regardless of which party is in control—has often failed to present a logical, well-coordinated program in accordance with a sound timetable, is that there has been so little coordination among the chairmen of the standing committees.

This is of course no criticism of any individual or any committee or any party. It is simply a statement of fact which the record will bear out.

FOREIGN RELATIONS REQUIRE COMMITTEE COORDINATION

I, for one, feel that, as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, this situation should be corrected.

I do not feel that the 83d Congress can be adequate to its foreign relations responsibilities, unless there is greater coordination among, for example, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and myself.

Consider for example, the instance of the distribution of agricultural surpluses abroad—involving still another committee. Here, obviously, it is essential that there be coordination, between the Foreign Relations and Agriculture Committees. And on a great many other issues, America cannot fulfill its global obligations without better coordination.

Already, informally and on a personal basis such coordination exists. But unless we set up some working mechanism to assemble the chairmen of the standing committees, particularly in advance of a session,

we will tend to proceed on a rather haphazard, hit-or-miss basis.

NEXT YEAR'S SESSION PARTICULARLY CROWDED

No one who looks at the mass of bills pending before us next year—Taft-Hartley, taxes, social security, Hawaiian statehood, St. Lawrence seaway, farm parity, and a great many others—can possibly believe that we are going to get through all of them, unless there is greater coordination and a better timetable mutually agreed upon.

Foreign policy today has become so complex with economic, military, political, diplomatic, agricultural and other overtones that we need the best thinking of all the committees, in conjunction with the thinking of the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs Committees.

I submit this suggestion formally, therefore, to our splendid acting majority leader and to the President of the United States.

MORE PARTY RESPONSIBILITY NEEDED

For a long time now, political scientists have recommended that there be better coordination among congressional committee chairmen and a greater degree of party responsibility. This is no "Ivy Tower" suggestion. Right now, in practice a party may commit itself to an objective. But unless the chairmen of the committee responsible for that objective's jurisdiction handles the matter adequately, the objective may never be met and the party's record may not be made.

If the Republican Party, therefore, is to fulfill its program, there must be more party responsibility.

But this is not a partisan question. This is a question of good government—responsible government.

HEALTH OF LEGISLATORS HARMED BY POOR PLANNING

The burdens of Congress have become so many—the pressures so vast—that we cannot fail to plan our way in another session.

This is particularly true of the close of sessions when the pressures amount to a climax.

We can ill afford the damage to the health of individual Senators and Representatives, caused by the overstrain of these final hectic weeks of sessions.

Let us plan for a more coordinated, better-timed legislative program in which we can do justice to the issues and justice to our own health.

I personally feel that I have a particular responsibility to comment on this procedure subject, because, with my great colleague from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] I stand second in seniority among the Republicans of this Chamber; with my able colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] standing first.

I do not ordinarily like to see still another committee or organization set up because from what I have seen of Washington, there are too many units downtown already stepping over each other's toes. But this committee of chairmen is one mechanism which would set a good example for the executive branch. It is vitally necessary if the Congress is to fulfill its dynamic challenges in this atomic age.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6391) making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. FENTON, Mr. COT-

TON, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, Mr. FORD, Mr. GARY, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. PASSMAN, and Mr. CANNON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6200) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment be agreed to en bloc, that the bill, as proposed to be amended, be considered as an original text for the purpose of amendment, and that no points of order be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that no points of order are waived?

Mr. BRIDGES. No points of order are waived, so that we may return to any committee amendment at any time.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and I have a point of order which we would like to raise in connection with an objection to one of the committee amendments.

Mr. BRIDGES. The proposed unanimous consent agreement would fully protect the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Under the heading "Chapter II," on page 2, after line 22, to insert:

"SENATE

"For payment to Anna Lee Smith, widow of Willis Smith, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina, \$12,500."

At the top of page 3, to insert:

"For payment to Lillian C. Tobey, widow of Charles W. Tobey, late a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, \$12,500."

Under the heading "Legislative branch—House of Representatives," on page 3, after line 5, to insert:

"For payment to Ruth B. Bryson, widow of Joseph R. Bryson, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina, \$12,500."

On page 3, after line 15, to insert:

"INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION FOR 1953

"For carrying out the provisions of the Joint Resolution entitled 'Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to defray the expenses of the annual meeting of the Interparliamentary Union for the year 1953, to be held in Washington, District of Columbia,' approved July 13, 1953 (Public Law 110, 83d Cong.), \$150,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, who hereby is authorized to advance to the President of the American group such sums within the appropriation as may be necessary to defray incidental expenses, to be accounted for in the same manner as provided by law for Senate committees."

On page 5, line 12, after the figures "3,000," to insert "purchase (not to exceed six) and"; on page 6, line 8, after the word "organizations," to strike out "\$60 million" and insert "\$80 million"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the comma and "of which \$70,000 may be made available to one or more private international broadcasting

licensees for the purpose of developing and broadcasting, under private auspices but under the supervision of the Department of State, radio programs to Western Europe and Latin America, which programs shall be designed to cultivate friendships with the peoples of the countries in those areas, and to build improved international understanding"; on page 7, line 21, after the word "films", to strike out "Provided further, That not to exceed 7,500 average annual positions, including the prorata portion of administrative support personnel, may be financed from this appropriation and the average number in each unit shall not exceed 66 2/3 percent of the number now employed both as to United States and local personnel respectively" and insert: *Provided further, That after the effective date of Reorganization Plan No. 8, 1953, existing appointments and assignments to the Foreign Service Reserve for the purposes of foreign information and educational activities which expire within 1 year of said effective date may be extended for a period of 1 year in addition to the period of appointment or assignment authorized in section 522 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 922):* *Provided further, That upon the effective date of Reorganization Plan Number 8 of 1953, the President may authorize the Director of the United States Information Agency thereby created to carry out (under such regulations as the President may from time to time prescribe) the functions of the Board of the Foreign Service with respect to personnel appointed or assigned for service in the United States Information Agency under the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended:* *Provided further, That funds made available under the head "International Information and Educational Activities" in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, and the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, for purchase, rent, construction and improvement of facilities for radio transmission and reception shall be available for such purposes relating to any radio facilities under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of State and for acquisition of quarters and necessary facilities for personnel required for operation of such facilities at remote locations outside the continental limits of the United States by purchase, construction, and alterations, and for initial furnishing of such quarters:* *Provided further, That the general provisions of the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1954, shall apply to this appropriation:* *Provided further, That in the event that Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953 establishing the United States Information Agency becomes effective, compliance with the statutory requirements as to investigation or certification of personnel applicable to any one of the three predecessor organizations under said Plan (The International Information Administration of the Department of State, the Mutual Security Agency or the Technical Cooperation Administration) shall be deemed to constitute compliance until January 1, 1954, with all such statutory requirements for any position in the United States Information Agency:* *Provided further, That, until January 1, 1954, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Director of the United States Information Agency created pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953 may terminate the employment of any person transferred to said agency:* *Provided further, That the operations of the International Broadcasting Service presently located in New York City shall be moved to the District of Columbia or its environs by June 30, 1954."*

Under the subhead "International Claims Commission," on page 10, line 13, after the figures "\$220,000", to strike out the colon and "Provided, That this paragraph shall be effective only after the enactment into law of the provisions of H. R. 5742 extend-

ing the period of operation of the Commission and increasing to 5 percent the amounts deducted from awards and ordered to be deposited into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury."

Under the heading "Department of Commerce—Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce—Export control," on page 12, line 6, after the word "controls," to strike out "\$3,700,000" and insert "\$4,500,000"; in line 6, after the word "controls", to strike out "\$900,000" and insert "\$1,125,000"; and at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "\$70,000" and insert "\$84,500."

On page 12, after line 11, to insert:

"MARITIME ACTIVITIES

"OPERATING-DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDIES

"For an additional amount for 'Operating-differential subsidies,' \$35,000,000, to remain available until expended."

Under the heading "Chapter IV—Treasury Department," on page 12, after line 17, to insert:

"OFFICE OF THE TREASURER

"CONTINGENT EXPENSES, PUBLIC MONIES

"For an additional amount for 'Contingent expenses, public moneys,' \$66,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriations for 'Salaries and expenses, Office of the Treasurer,' fiscal year 1954."

On page 15, after line 15, to insert:

"CHAPTER V

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

"Production and Marketing Administration

"Agricultural Adjustment Programs

"For an additional amount for 'Agricultural Adjustment Programs,' \$3,000,000, of which not more than \$700,000 may be transferred to the appropriation account, 'Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938'."

On page 15, after line 24, to insert:

"The funds appropriated to the Department of Agriculture in the act of June 4, 1952 (Public Law 371) shall remain available until December 31, 1954."

On page 16, line 3, to change the chapter number from "V" to "VI."

Under the heading "Chapter VI—Department of the Interior," on page 16, after line 10, to insert:

"TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

"For an additional amount for 'Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands,' \$424,000."

On page 16, line 14, to change the chapter number from "VI" to "VII."

Under the subhead "Council of Economic Advisers," on page 17, line 14, after the word "exceeding," to strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$25,000"; and in line 16, after the figure "\$300," to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$275,000."

Under the subhead "Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel—Salaries and expenses," on page 18, line 2, after the numerals "723", to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$300,000."

On page 18, after line 19, to insert:

"COMMISSION ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For expenses necessary for the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, \$400,000: *Provided, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law, during the first session of the 83d Congress, of H. R. 5495."*

On page 20, after line 3, to insert:

"GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"HOSPITAL FACILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"Appropriation item under the heading 'General Services Administration, Hospital Facilities in the District of Columbia,' contained in the act approved July 15, 1952

(66 Stat. 637), is hereby amended by inserting after the word 'appropriation' at the end of the first proviso and before the colon, the phrase 'including in addition thereto Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum:'.

On page 20, after line 12, to insert:

**"SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
"SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

"For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the Small Business Administration, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$2,925,000; and in addition, not to exceed \$1,575,000 may be transferred to this appropriation from the Revolving Fund, Small Business Administration, for administrative expenses in connection with activities financed under said fund: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for necessary expenses in connection with the liquidation of the Small Defense Plants Administration."

On page 21, after line 2, to insert:

"REVOLVING FUND

"For the revolving fund authorized by the Small Business Act of 1953, to be available without fiscal year limitation, \$70,000,000."

On page 21, after line 6, to insert:

**"REVOLVING FUND, SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS
ADMINISTRATION**

"The revolving fund authorized by paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of section 714 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, shall remain available during the fiscal year 1954 for payment of obligations and direct costs under contracts entered into during fiscal year 1953."

Under the subhead "Subversive Activities Control Board," on page 21, at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "\$70,000" and insert "\$150,000"; and in line 20, after the word "travel", to insert a colon and "*Provided further*, That the limitation on the purchase of newspapers and periodicals in the First Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1954, is hereby increased from \$100 to \$500."

On page 22, line 1, to change the chapter number from "VII" to "VIII."

Under the heading "Chapter VIII—Military construction—Department of Defense—Department of the Air Force—Acquisition and construction of real property," on page 22, after line 5, to strike out:

"Not to exceed \$240,776,000 of the unobligated balances of funds heretofore granted under this head shall be available, until expended, for acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Air Force, as authorized by the act of October 27, 1949 (63 Stat. 936), as amended, the act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, 81st Cong.), the act of January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, 81st Cong.), the act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, 82d Cong.), and the act of July 14, 1952 (Public Law 534, 82d Cong.), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the land, and interests therein, may be acquired and construction may be prosecuted thereon prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended, and hire of passenger motor vehicles."

And insert:

"For an additional amount for acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Air Force, as authorized by the act of March 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 17), the act of October 27, 1949 (63 Stat. 936), as amended, the act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, 81st Cong.), the act of January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, 81st Cong.), the act of September 28, 1951

(Public Law 155, 82d Cong.), and the act of July 14, 1952 (Public Law 534, 82d Cong.), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the land and interests therein, may be acquired and construction may be prosecuted thereon prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; and hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$310,000,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 24, after line 10, to insert:

"Sec. 705. Funds appropriated to the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force under the headings 'Military construction,' 'Public works,' and 'Acquisition and construction of real property,' respectively, in fiscal year 1954 and prior years, are hereby made available for military public works authorized for such departments by any law cited in any of such appropriations or any law enacted during the 83d Congress: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$5,000,000 of such funds appropriated to the Department of the Army, and not to exceed \$1,500,000 of such funds appropriated to the Department of the Navy, shall be available for the purposes of advance planning as authorized by section 504 of the act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 364), in addition to amounts previously made available for such purpose."

At the top of page 25, to change the chapter number from "VIII" to "IX."

At the top of page 26, to insert:

"For financing a part of the United States share of the cost of remedial works in the Niagara River, to be undertaken in accordance with article II of the treaty between the United States of America and Canada, ratified by the United States Senate on August 9, 1950, to remain available until expended, \$1,500,000."

On page 26, after line 6, to insert:

"Of the \$1,100,000 available under this head and allocated for the continuation of the Covington, Ky., Flood Control Project, so much as may be necessary may be expended for the purpose of installing adequate pumping capacity at the 24th Street Station in such city in order to obviate the need for a ponding area in the vicinity of such station."

On page 26, after line 13, to insert:

"Not to exceed \$108,000 of the amount available under this head shall be available for the widening of the channel of the Calumet River, Ill. and Ind., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945."

On page 26, after line 17, to insert:

"For an additional amount for 'Construction, general', including the objects specified under this head in the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1954, to remain available until expended, \$2,200,000."

At the top of page 27, to change the chapter number from "IX" to "X."

Under the subhead "Department of State—Government in occupied areas," on page 31, line 11, after the word "of", to insert "\$17,500 and the United States Member of the Board for the Validation of German Bonds in the United States at a salary of \$14,800."

On page 34, line 12, to change the chapter number from "X" to "XI."

Under the heading "Chapter XI—Emergency agencies—Executive Office of the President—Office of Defense Mobilization—Salaries and expenses," on page 34, line 21, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert "\$3,250,000", and in line 22, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That contracts under this appropriation for temporary or intermittent services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), may be renewed annually."

Under the heading "Independent offices—Defense transport activities—Salaries and expenses," on page 35, line 9, after the word

"appropriation," to strike out "\$350,000" and insert "\$500,000."

Under subhead "Economic Stabilization Agency—Salaries and expenses," on page 35, line 16, after the numerals "1953", where they occur the second time, to strike out "and not to exceed \$290,000 for the liquidation of the Economic Stabilization Agency, \$1,190,000" and insert "\$900,000."

Under the heading "Department of Commerce—Office of the Secretary—Salaries and expenses, defense production activities," on page 36, line 11, after the word "services", to strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$5,500,000"; and in line 12, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the colon and "*Provided*, That no part of these funds shall be available for continuation of the functions of the Industry Evaluation Board."

Under the heading "Department of the Interior—Office of the Secretary—Salaries and expenses, defense production activities," on page 36, line 24, after the figures "\$500,000", to strike out the colon and "*Provided*, That these funds shall be available only for continuation of the Petroleum Administration for Defense."

Under the heading "Federal Civil Defense Administration—Operations," on page 37, line 20, after the word "conclusive", to strike out "\$7,900,000" and insert "\$9,150,000."

Under the subhead "Federal contributions," on page 38, line 2, after the word "funds", to strike out "\$9,870,000" and insert "\$12,000,000."

Under the subhead "Emergency supplies and equipment," on page 38, line 7, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$20,000,000" and insert "\$40,000,000."

On page 38, line 8, to change the chapter number from "XI" to "XII."

Under the heading "Chapter XII—Claims, audited claims, and judgments," on page 38, line 15, after the word "in" to insert "Senate documents numbered 58 and 65, and"; and in line 17, after the word "Congress", to strike out "\$2,732,954" and insert "\$12,121,334."

On page 39, line 5, to change the chapter number from "XII" to "XIII."

Under the heading "Chapter XIII—General provisions—Title I—Departments, agencies, and corporations," on page 39, line 7, to change the section number from "1201" to "1301."

On page 39, line 13, to change the section number from "1202" to "1302"; in line 24, after the word "date", to strike out "or"; and in line 25, after the word "States" to insert "or (4) is an alien from the Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence."

On page 40, line 18, to change the section number from "1203" to "1303."

On page 41, line 7, to change the section number from "1204" to "1304."

On page 41, line 12, to change the section number from "1205" to "1305."

On page 41, line 22, to change the section number from "1206" to "1306."

On page 42, line 13, to change the section number from "1207" to "1307."

On page 42, line 20, to change the section number from "1208" to "1308."

On page 44, line 3, to change the section number from "1209" to "1309."

On page 44, line 13, to change the section number from "1210" to "1310."

On page 44, line 22, to change the section number from "1211" to "1311."

On page 45, line 3, to change the section number from "1212" to "1312."

On page 45, line 20, to change the section number from "1213" to "1313."

On page 46, after line 12, to insert:

"Sec. 1314. Funds made available in this or any other act shall hereafter be available for examination of estimates of appropriations in the field and the use of such funds for such purpose shall be subject only to regulations by the standing committees concerned."

On page 46, after line 17, to insert:

"Sec. 1315. (a) During the current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation for the executive branch contained in this or another act, or of any funds made available for expenditure by any corporation included in this or any other act, shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government whose principal or primary duties consist of acting as chauffeur or driver of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance), unless such appropriation is specifically authorized, to be used for paying the compensation of employees performing such duties. This subsection shall not apply to—

"(1) Any person employed by an agency for which appropriations of funds were made available by the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, and whose place of duty is in a foreign country

"(2) Any person acting as chauffeur for—

"The President of the United States

"The Secretary of State

"The Secretary of the Treasury

"The Attorney General

"The Postmaster General

"The Secretary of the Interior

"The Undersecretary of the Interior

"The Secretary of Agriculture

"The Secretary of Commerce

"(3) Automobiles operated by—

"The Federal Bureau of Investigation

"The United States Secret Service

"The Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and Interior, outside of the District of Columbia

"(4) One-half of the chauffeur-driven automobiles in operation in the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce on July 1, 1951

"(5) Agencies for which appropriations or funds were made available by the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, or the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1953

"(6) The agencies named in subsection (b) of this section.

"(b) In no event shall the number of passenger-carrying vehicles which may be operated during the current fiscal year at the seat of Government under any appropriation or authorization for the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board, the Railroad Retirement Board, or the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service exceed 50 percent of the number in use as of June 30, 1951."

On page 48, after line 16, to strike out:

"TITLE II—PAYMENT OF JUDGMENTS

"Sec. 1214. There are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated and out of the postal revenues, respectively, such sums as hereafter may be necessary for the payment, as certified by the Comptroller General, of judgments rendered by the district courts and Court of Claims against the United States not otherwise provided for: *Provided*, That such payments may be made upon receipt of transcripts of the judgments from the Attorney General."

At the top of page 49, to strike out:

"Sec. 1215. Subsection (b) of section 2411 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read:

"(b) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (a) of this section, interest on judgments against the United States under section 1346 of this title made final after review on appeal by the United States shall be paid at the rate of 4 percent per annum from the date of the original judgment to the date of the mandate of the appellate court."

On page 49, after line 8, to strike out:

"Sec. 1216. Subsection (b) of section 2516 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read:

"(b) Interest on judgments against the United States by the Court of Claims affirmed by the Supreme Court after review on petition of the United States shall be paid at the rate of 4 percent per annum from the date of the original judgment to the date of the mandate of affirmance."

On page 49, after line 15, to strike out:

"Sec. 1217. Within 60 days after receipt of any transcript of judgment from the Attorney General, which in the opinion of the Comptroller General shall not be paid as rendered, the Comptroller General shall refer such judgment to the Congress, with a statement of his reasons therefor, and any judgment so referred shall be paid out of the appropriation herein made only pursuant to specific authorization contained in a general appropriation act: *Provided*, That such authorization may include limitations on amounts to be paid as principal sums, interest, attorney's fees, and so forth."

At the top of page 50, to strike out:

"Sec. 1218. The annual report of the Comptroller General shall include a statement of all the judgments certified for payment by him during the previous year showing the dates and amounts thereof and the parties in whose favor they were rendered."

On page 50, after line 5, to strike out:

"Sec. 1219. The provision of law codified as section 2518 of title 28, United States Code, shall not be applicable to judgments payable hereunder."

On page 50, after line 8, to strike out:

"Sec. 1220. This act shall apply only to judgments hereafter rendered and all laws in effect at the time of entering judgments prior to the enactment hereof shall remain in effect with respect to such judgments."

On page 50, after line 12, to strike out:

"Sec. 1221. This title may be cited as the 'Payment of Judgments Act, 1953'."

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, is it in order to offer amendments at this time?

Mr. BRIDGES. Perhaps the more orderly way to proceed would be for me to offer the amendments which the committee has instructed me to offer, and which I have agreed to offer. When those are disposed of, we can take up individual amendments.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The only reason I ask the question is that the Judiciary Committee is now meeting. We are trying to dispose of all nominations and bills presently on the agenda before the close of the session. I should like to return to that committee. I do not believe my amendment would require very lengthy consideration. I do not wish to ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing that the Senator from Maryland may offer his amendment. Then I can proceed with the committee amendments.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I thank my friend from New Hampshire. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 26, after line 21, it is proposed to insert the following new paragraph:

For an additional amount for the commencement of construction of the Anacostia River flood-control project, Maryland and the

District of Columbia, as authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1950, \$500,000.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, the periodic floods in the vicinity of the Peace Cross have resulted in many, many years of deplorable hazard, serious inconvenience, and unnecessary damage to property, to say nothing of the fact that highway transportation is obstructed for lengthy intervals. The seriousness of this situation, as it relates to the defense of the Nation's Capital cannot be minimized, and in my opinion, these untenable and recurrent conditions cannot be permitted to continue.

Thus far this year, there have been 19 floods at the Peace Cross, and it is estimated that 35,000 automobiles a day use this arterial highway intersection. At flood stage, it requires little imagination to visualize the tremendous congestion and confusion.

A project to protect that area is a part of a more comprehensive flood-control and navigation project for the Anacostia River and tributaries, authorized by Congress in the Flood Control Act approved May 17, 1950, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers as contained in House Document 202, 81st Congress. The plan of improvement provides in general for channel improvement along the river and its northeast and northwest branches, together with the construction of levees, pumping plants, and appurtenant facilities. The current estimated Federal cost of these works is approximately \$13 million.

The General Assembly of the State of Maryland, in recent session, has likewise given special attention to this problem by authorizing the expenditure of \$4,250,000 to carry out the State's obligation of the flood-control plan as prepared by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army. However, there is a qualification on this money which requires that the Congress must make available a minimum appropriation as evidence that the Federal Government is prepared to meet its obligation. This, of course, would involve funds in excess of the \$175,000 for further planning which has been approved in the budget.

In the absence of federally approved funds, the State of Maryland has decided to proceed with measures which might alleviate, in part, these serious circumstances. With the approval of the Governor of Maryland, the Maryland State Roads Commission will expend \$600,000 to raise the level of certain main and arterial roads. Frankly, I believe that such steps are impractical and inconsistent with the planning of the project. Conceivably, and there is much authoritative opinion to substantiate this point, these roads would require further alteration when construction of the entire project is started. This would certainly constitute a needless waste of Federal and State funds.

The civil functions appropriation bill, H. R. 5376, recently passed by the Senate, appropriated for this purpose \$500,000. We lost the appropriation in conference. I do not know how or why we lost it. Certainly it should never have been

taken out of the bill. Nevertheless, it was done. That bill, however, as passed, provided \$175,000 for further planning. Mr. President, we do not need \$175,000 for further planning. We need some money with which to start the project so the funds of the State of Maryland may be used. Even if a minimum amount of money, such as \$500,000, or even \$100,000, is provided in the pending bill, so the Army engineers can at least supervise for the first year the expenditure of the State funds—if we can only succeed in having some money provided in the pending bill to get the project started—I feel we can carry through to a successful conclusion, and in that way save the State of Maryland \$600,000, and ultimately save the Federal Government the additional cost of undoing what the unwise expenditure of those funds would do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, as the distinguished and able Senator from Maryland has said, a similar amendment was added to the civil functions appropriation bill after hearings before the Committee on Appropriations. The provision, however, was eliminated in conference. The Senator has expressed his conviction in the matter and has favored it, I am somewhat doubtful about what the House will do about it. However, if the Senator is willing to modify his amendment, reducing the amount from \$500,000, we would have a new talking point in conference, and I would be glad to take such an amendment to conference.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I will say to my good friend, the able chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that the Senator from Maryland is willing to make any reasonable compromise on the amount so long as the Federal Government now assumes the obligation to go forward with construction it should have assumed years ago.

A subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate has approved the project after full and careful hearings and study and the full committee has approved it. It is a worthy project, but it was lost in conference. I say to my good friend from New Hampshire that I would be very happy to modify my proposed amendment and accept any amount he may suggest so he may go to conference with it. Then if it is agreed to in conference the State funds will be made available under the terms of legislation enacted by the General Assembly of Maryland last year. In that way the work can then proceed.

Mr. BRIDGES. I would not accept the identical amendment which was lost in the Civil Functions Conference but if a reduction is made to \$200,000, and if the Senator from Maryland will so modify his amendment, I shall accept it and take it to conference.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I modify my amendment by striking out the figure "\$500,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "\$200,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be modified in accordance with the Senator's request.

Without objection, the amendment, as modified, is agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I thank my able friend from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, after line 3, it is proposed to insert:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Miscellaneous items: For an additional amount for miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, fiscal year 1953, \$50,000.

Mr. BRIDGES. This item is for expenditures by special committees created by the Senate, which have spent or are in process of spending the money in carrying out the duties imposed upon them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 12, line 11, after the word "Secretary", it is proposed to insert: "Provided, That in addition, not to exceed \$100,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation made available under this head for the fiscal year 1953, shall remain available during the current fiscal year to cover the cost of reduction in force of officers and employees whose services are terminated."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this is a simple amendment. It provides \$100,000 of unobligated money—no new money—to pay the terminal leave cost of 120 people whose services are being terminated in this Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer another amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, after line 15, it is proposed to insert:

CHAPTER V

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

Salaries and expenses

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," \$200,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 6049, 83d Congress.

Mr. BRIDGES. The amendment would implement a House bill with respect to Federal assistance on school construction. Every Senator is familiar with the subject. The amendment would implement the administration of the fund.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I send another amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, line 16, it is proposed to insert the following:

CHAPTER V

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

Assistance for School Construction

For providing school facilities and for grants to local educational agencies in federally affected areas, as authorized by titles III and IV of the act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815), as amended, including not to exceed \$500,000 for necessary expenses of technical services rendered by other agencies, \$84,500,000, to remain available until expended, and of which \$10 million shall be available for carrying out title IV of said act: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for salaries or other direct expenses of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: *Provided further*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 6049, 83d Congress.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this is a school construction item. It provides for assistance on construction in federally affected areas. I should like to make this point clear to the Senate. The amendment provides the funds which will be authorized by H. R. 6049. That bill has passed the House and it has been reported to the Senate with amendments, but it has not passed the Senate. I want to be very frank with the Senate. This is the last money bill which will go through at this session. If the authorization bill is not passed this appropriation will not be used. We will take note of the situation in conference.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. This is a fund for the construction of educational institutions in federally impacted areas. Is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Are there designated in the bill amounts which are specifically allocated to certain defense areas, or is that matter to be determined by the Department, upon the making of the proper and necessary showings?

Mr. BRIDGES. There is no direct appropriation for any particular area. It is to be determined by the general formula which is prescribed in H. R. 6049 and by the case presented in conformity with the formula.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the distinguished chairman of the committee advise the Senate whether the amount of \$84 million, I believe, is sufficient to cover the schools that are eligible for this Federal aid, but who, for one reason or another, did not have their applications completed in time? It seems to me that I recall that the amount required for this purpose was an additional \$95 million.

Mr. BRIDGES. This is the budget figure for the pending authorization. The testimony was that this amount will be sufficient to take care of approximately 500 districts, for such aid as needed; and certainly it will cover the applications which can be processed during the coming year.

As the Senator from Oklahoma knows, this amount may not cover everything that may be desired or that may be applied for.

Mr. MONRONEY. My point is that under this program there is outstanding, as I understand, for work already done for which the Government has incurred an obligation, approximately \$95 million additional. Does this provision preclude school districts that may not have been able to qualify fully because of not completing their application forms in every detail, but whose entitlement was actually and generally within the provisions of the law; will they be able at a later date to qualify under subsequent appropriations which may be made to provide relief for them from their hardship?

Mr. BRIDGES. The new authorization which we are due to consider shortly will provide additional relief for areas which qualify under the terms of that authority.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HUNT. Let me ask the distinguished chairman of the committee whether the moneys appropriated in this bill for this particular purpose will take care of the situations recently developed because of an opinion of the Attorney General, under which schools which heretofore have been receiving oil royalty money under the Leasing Act of 1920, I believe, have now been declared to be ineligible to receive funds from other than the one source—thus bringing about the situation I have in mind in the case of the school for the city of Cheyenne, where that ruling is costing the city school some \$60,000. I wonder whether this appropriation will replace those moneys.

Mr. BRIDGES. I cannot answer that question positively. The authorizing legislation for which we are providing funds at this time has yet to be acted on by the Senate. It may be that the new legislation will give relief in the situation referred to. I think that is where the situation must be corrected. I am a little uncertain about this matter, because there has not been testimony about that particular problem before our committee.

Mr. HUNT. Recently, on taking up the matter with the Attorney General, I have been advised that a bill was introduced in the House of Representatives to take care of this situation. I wonder whether it would take care of the authorization.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Wyoming can present this matter when the authorization measure comes up in the Senate—as it probably will within a matter of hours. Then that situation can be corrected.

My attention has just been called to the fact that the basic act provides some variations from the formula, in order to take care of special situations. It would appear that this is the change which was referred to by the Attorney General.

But I say frankly to the Senator from Wyoming that I do not know. I can find out, and can report to my colleague from Wyoming; and if there is something particular which can be done on the legislative act we shall be aware of the problem. But I do not know at the moment.

Mr. HUNT. If it is agreeable to the distinguished chairman of the committee, during the day I shall present the correspondence I have to the committee staff, so they may be advised.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], on page 15, in line 16.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, in line 13, it is proposed to insert the following:

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION IN KOREA

There are hereby made available out of the funds available to the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1954 and certified by the Secretary of Defense to be saved as a result of the armistice in Korea, not to exceed \$200 million to be available, under such terms and conditions as the President may specify and through such officers or agencies as he may designate, for relief and rehabilitation in Korea: *Provided*, That funds made available hereunder shall be used only in such parts of Korea as the President deems to be not under Communist control.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this is an important amendment. I should like the Senate to be fully informed of the provisions of the amendment and its effect.

All of us are aware of the truce in Korea and of the cessation of fighting there. All of us hope a permanent peace will be established. The recent conflict in Korea has caused untold losses in blood and money and untold amounts of suffering. Our gallant ally, South Korea, has staked its very life on the outcome. The opposing armies ranged up and down Korea. Most of the peninsula at one time or another was a battlefield. The devastation of war has been the result. There have been brought about great suffering, terrific dislocations, destruction on a gigantic scale, and all the other dire consequences of war.

Since 1950 more than 1 million South Koreans have died, 2½ million are homeless, 5 million are dependent upon relief in order to stay alive, and the survivors of the war in Korea need help in order to be able to have the bare necessities of life.

The purpose of this amendment is to have a little of the money we would have spent in prosecuting the war, if it had

continued, applied to the Korean people—not those under Communist domination but those in South Korea—in order to rehabilitate their section of the country.

This money has already been appropriated to the Department of Defense, so a new appropriation is not required.

I could speak for hours on this matter, but I have at least outlined the problem.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I wish to say to the Senator from New Hampshire, the chairman of the committee, that this is a most important matter.

What are the other nations that are supposed to have been, or were reputed to have been, our allies doing in regard to this problem? Are they offering to assist in the rehabilitation of Korea, inasmuch as in the past some of them have acted in a sitdown capacity while the South Korean troops and the United States troops were fighting in that war?

Mr. BRIDGES. The question of the able Senator from Kansas is a very pertinent one. There is a United Nations Korean relief organization to which we are making contributions and to which some of our allies are contributing. Others are supposed to contribute to it. Others—as was the case during the Korean war—probably are not contributing.

I am as much concerned as is the Senator from Kansas over the fact that during the war some members of the United Nations remained on the sidelines and let United States troops and South Korean troops and some forces of a few of our more cooperative allies carry the load.

To be frank with the Senator from Kansas, this item is purely a United States grant. We hope that through the United Nations Rehabilitation Commission, to which we also contribute, other nations will contribute in some degree; but this is purely a United States program.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. In the opinion of the Senator from New Hampshire, will this be construed as creating a precedent on the part of this Nation, to the effect that we shall not carry the major load in connection with the rehabilitation of Korea?

Mr. BRIDGES. I hope it will not be considered a precedent. So far as the Senator from New Hampshire is concerned, he desires it to be understood that he does not want this action to be considered as a precedent. I must point out, however, that there are two programs to which we contribute in the rehabilitation of Korea. The fund we are now considering is purely a United States grant. The other, UNKRA, is supported by United States and other nations contributions. That was covered in the mutual security bill which was passed yesterday.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from New Hampshire really believe that any country other than the United States is going to contribute toward Korean rehabilitation?

Mr. BRIDGES. I entertain the hope that other countries will contribute; but I may say I have been disillusioned on various occasions in the past. I anticipate that my disillusionment will probably continue.

Mr. MORSE. Let us look at the matter realistically. When we are giving aid to all the other allies that have been involved in the war, does the Senator doubt for a moment, if they make any contributions to Korea, it will simply involve transferring figures from one set of books to another, and that the final contribution will be ours? I do not think we ought to deceive the American people. I do not intimate that the Senator is doing so, but the Senate should not mislead the American people as to who is going to make the contributions.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have endeavored to explain that aspect of the matter, as did the Senator from Kansas. As I now address my distinguished colleague from Oregon, I desire to say to him that I certainly do not want to mislead anyone. I have stated frankly that this is a United States contribution, without other help, and that the only assistance that is anticipated on the part of other countries will be that which is given indirectly through the United Nations Rehabilitation Commission. I accept what the Senator from Oregon has said. I realize that it is absolutely true. We have aided many other nations, who in turn are contributing indirectly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield at that point, I think a reference to the side slips on the mutual security appropriation bill may throw some light on the subject.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. There was testimony regarding UNKRA contributions. At page 44 of the side slips we find a statement of the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, listing pledges and contributions as of July 1, 1953. The list shows that several countries are contributing to the fund. The table shows the amount pledged, the amount paid, and the balance outstanding. Without going through the entire list, I shall presently ask to have the table printed in the RECORD. It is available to all Senators who would like to examine it. The list does not show the total number of contributions from all sources, both from member states and nonmember states, because certain countries outside the United Nations have contributed. The total amount of all pledges by the various countries is \$207,467,279; the amount paid, \$70,525,975. The balance outstanding, for the entire list of countries, including our own, is \$136,941,304. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency statement of pledges and contributions as of July 1, 1953

[Expressed in terms of United States dollars]

	Pledged	Paid	Balance outstanding
MEMBER STATES			
Argentina.....	500,000	500,000	-----
Australia.....	4,002,710	1,366,856	2,635,854
Belgium.....	200,000	-----	200,000
Burma.....	49,934	49,934	-----
Canada.....	6,904,762	6,904,762	-----
Chile.....	250,000	-----	250,000
Denmark.....	860,000	289,555	570,445
Dominican Republic.....	10,000	-----	10,000
Egypt.....	28,716	-----	28,716
El Salvador.....	500	-----	500
Ethiopia.....	40,000	40,000	-----
Guatemala.....	-----	-----	-----
Honduras.....	2,500	2,500	-----
Indonesia.....	100,000	100,000	-----
Israel.....	33,600	33,600	-----
Lebanon.....	50,000	50,000	-----
Liberia.....	15,000	15,000	-----
Luxembourg.....	30,000	30,000	-----
Netherlands.....	263,158	263,158	-----
New Zealand.....	560,000	-----	560,000
Norway.....	829,000	11,900	817,100
Panama.....	3,000	-----	3,000
Paraguay.....	10,000	10,000	-----
Saudi Arabia.....	20,000	20,000	-----
Sweden.....	966,518	322,237	644,281
Syria.....	11,408	-----	11,408
United Kingdom.....	28,000,000	8,540,000	19,460,000
United States.....	162,500,000	50,750,000	111,750,000
Venezuela.....	70,000	70,000	-----
Total.....	260,310,806	69,369,502	136,941,304
NONMEMBER STATES			
Austria.....	162,936	162,936	-----
Italy.....	960,000	960,000	-----
Monaco.....	281	281	-----
Switzerland.....	23,256	23,256	-----
Vietnam.....	10,000	10,000	-----
Total.....	1,156,473	1,156,473	-----
Total all governments.....	207,467,279	70,525,975	136,941,304

¹ Guatemala has offered "several thousand tons of timber" which has not yet been valued.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. In connection with the table to which the distinguished acting majority leader has referred, can the Senator from New Hampshire give us some idea of how long those pledges have been in effect.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If I may interrupt, the list shows the pledges, the amounts paid, and the balances outstanding, country by country. If the Senator from Kansas would like to examine the list, it is available to him.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. In case the amendment now before the Senate is agreed to, to provide a contribution by the United States in the sum of \$200 million, who will supervise the handling of those funds?

Mr. FERGUSON rose.

Mr. BRIDGES. Perhaps the Senator from Michigan will answer that question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Having been in Korea, where I observed the conditions, I would think, from the practical stand-

point, it would be an army job during the period of the truce. Having learned something about the conditions in Korea, and having also visited all of the air fields, I am in favor of this amendment. Particularly since the shooting has stopped, I think it is vitally important that the assistance be given, and that it be administered by the Army, or by whomever it is determined can administer it without complications.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield at that point, I think it might throw further light on the matter to call attention to the fact that the President's recommendation which was made prior to the cease-fire being finally entered into, when it was still a matter of touch and go as to whether a truce might or might not be effected was based on the idea that, immediately following the cease-fire, and for as long as the cease-fire continued in effect, there would be a lessening of the costs in Korea, from a monetary standpoint of about \$1,200,000,000. I refer to the expenditures for ammunition, equipment, and so forth. The Senator understands that the troop pay and the feeding of the troops goes on; and so the mere cessation of hostilities does not put an end to the costs in Korea, as the Senator knows, particularly as long as we have to maintain forces in Korea. But the actual expenditures on the war itself, it has been estimated, will be lessened by about \$1,200,000,000.

The President wanted to be in a position to have the \$200 million available for immediate use in the conduct of the most essential type of rehabilitation, during the period of time when the Congress will not be in session.

He felt that if the funds were available, as they would be by utilizing a fraction of the costs incident to the war, the United Nations, and particularly the United States, could demonstrate to the Korean people that this is not merely a matter that is being discussed, but it is actually the doing of something which is essential. For example, a railroad bridge in the line of communication might have been destroyed or it might be necessary to rehabilitate the economy of the country, or to provide food and other supplies to areas that might be in need of them. The President felt that this would afford him the necessary flexibility in the administration of the program, and that it would be a most essential part of the program.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I appreciate the explanation given by the distinguished acting majority leader. The President of South Korea is Syngman Rhee. I assume there will be cooperation with President Rhee, a man who stood up for the rights of his people in the administration of his country and who bore the brunt of conflict in which his people were engaged. May we have some further enlightenment on that subject?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think it is very clear that this particular fund is not to be handled by the UNKRA organization. In my best judgment, based on all the information which has been made available to me, this particular fund will become immediately available to the United States authorities; and, as the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire has pointed out, certainly during the period of the cease-fire, before we learn whether ultimately there will be a peace, it will be handled by the United States authorities as distinguished from UNKRA.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would assume that, since the work would be done within a sovereign country, it would, of course, be handled in cooperation with the President of South Korea and the Government of that nation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. First, I desire to make clear that I am very much in favor of our making these contributions. I think they are necessary to demonstrate to the people of Asia that we do not propose to walk out on them in their struggle for freedom. We cannot fight a war and not have a job of rehabilitation to do at the end of the war in behalf of our friends.

I think it is also important that, irrespective of where they obtain the funds, we get our friends in the United Nations to join us in this great humanitarian cause.

I am very glad the Senator from New Hampshire has made the remarks he has made that this is basically and essentially a United States contribution. I hope the time will come when the source of the contributions by our friends will not always be traced to the United States Treasury; but the list which the acting majority leader has placed in the Record—and I am glad he did, although, of course, it does not show what, in accounting, constitutes an offset in each and every contribution the allies in the United Nations are recorded as having pledged or having made—because, as I look at the list I fail to see any country on it that has not been a direct beneficiary of American contributions far in excess of any amount it is contributing to Korea, with the possible exception of Argentina. But even in that case we would have to take into account the loan we made to Argentina through the Export-Import Bank to pay off American investors in Argentina.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I personally know something about the conditions in Korea. Our soldiers are living in that war-torn land with the Korean people, and it is a very difficult job, since the shooting has stopped. I have in mind the let-down to the Korean people and even to our own soldiers. I believe this is a task the United States should undertake.

I hope the military authorities can administer this aid in such a manner as to demonstrate that we have in mind the interests of the Korean people. I believe we should be greatly disappointed if this fund were to be administered by others, such as the United Nations, which is a combination, which includes the Soviet Union and other nations which did not put their shoulders to the wheel to aid in stopping the war in Korea.

I hope we will contribute this amount so that the President can administer it during these very crucial days. I believe they are crucial in Korea at the present time. If peace results from the truce, we shall be very fortunate, and we should try to do the things that will bring peace. But I believe we should be firm with those with whom we are going to negotiate and be charitable to those who have participated in the sacrifice with us.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that I was very much interested in the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan; but the thing about which I am very vitally concerned is not the \$200 million, although that is a most important matter for us to consider, but that by this record today we shall not hold out to the world and to our allies who should have been with us in the war that the sole rehabilitating program in Korea is up to the United States of America, or the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator is entirely correct. As he knows, at the time the cease fire went into effect—we are using only approximate figures for security reasons—we had approximately 350,000 of our forces in Korea. The Republic of Korea, I believe, had approximately 400,000 troops, and all the other members of the United Nations put together—and only 16 out of the 60 members contributed anything at all—contributed less than 35,000 troops. So they contributed less than 10 percent of what the United States of America alone contributed, and they contributed less than 5 percent of what the United States and the Republic of Korea combined contributed.

The Senator understands that the Republic of Korea was kept out of the United Nations by a Soviet veto.

That being so, from the point of view of sacrifice—it is true they were trying to defend their own country—the Republic of Korea, certainly, in proportion to its population, did, I think, a magnificent job. When the cease-fire took place, while they had a few thousand more troops than we had, actually they were holding about two-thirds of the battle line. It was certainly a good example.

If in Europe we could be sure that the NATO members were bearing as full a share in helping to defend themselves

against communism as was borne by the little Republic of Korea, I think we would not have to be quite so much concerned with the menace of international communism and the future plans of the men in the Kremlin. Certainly, the Republic of Korea has set a great example of a people who have been willing to do the utmost to defend themselves while they were asking for help from this country and from the rest of the free world.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from California has brought out and stressed the realities of the situation, including the burden we carried in the Korean war and that which we are now carrying.

In answer to the Senator from Kansas, I want to say that certainly we are not establishing a precedent for the future. We are meeting an emergency situation with which we are now faced, but we are establishing no precedent for other situations in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The amendment was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, inviting the attention of the acting minority leader, so I may further advise the Senate, we are now, of course, considering the supplemental appropriation bill, House bill 6200. When we have completed our consideration of that bill, I expect to call up the conference report on the Continental Shelf bill. In addition to that, there are a number of other bills to be considered sometime during the course of the day. I have furnished the calendar numbers to the acting minority leader. They are Calendar Nos. 675, 677, 687, 696, 707, 700, 694, and 706.

As the Senate has been advised on several occasions, at 2 o'clock this afternoon the Senate will proceed to the memorial services in connection with the life, character, and public work of the late distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, Senator TOBEY. Later in the afternoon or in the early evening we will probably have a calendar call of bills to which there is no objection, running from Calendar No. 647, where we left off at the last call, probably through Calendar No. 672.

I am informed there is a possibility that reports and bills may be available as far as calendar 687 or 688. But we shall not take up any bills on the call of the calendar in cases where the bills or reports are not available. During the course of the afternoon or evening tomorrow, it is my hope to have another calendar call, beginning at the point where we finish today, and again depending on whether printed reports and bills are available.

There may be certain unusual circumstances during the closing day of the session when a bill of great importance should be taken up. In that case, it is my desire to give advance notice to the Senate. I would want to be certain that both the chairman of the committee which handled the bill and the ranking

minority leader were on the floor at the time. I would want every safeguard to be taken, because, having served in a State legislature during the closing days of a session, and having been a Member of the United States Senate for 8 years, I desire that all Senators be adequately notified before any bill is taken up, when it is not on the calendar or when a report is not available. When a bill is of overwhelming importance, I do not think it would be good legislative procedure to act otherwise.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Does the acting majority leader intend to leave the impression that the bills whose calendar numbers he stated will be taken up in the order in which he announced them?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No, I would not say that, because a number of committees are meeting during the session of the Senate today, and it would depend on whether the Senator handling a bill was on the floor, and upon other conditions.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Will time be given to call the Senator concerned to the floor?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; in all cases that will be done.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the distinguished majority leader realizes, the Senate has been working overtime during the past 2 or 3 weeks, in the hope that we could adjourn by tomorrow or the next day. I am wondering what the prospects are.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say that up until this morning I had felt certain that with the legislative program before the Congress, we could easily meet our adjournment time of 12 o'clock midnight tomorrow.

If the Senator will ask me the question later in the day, after I have had an opportunity to consult with the minority leader, with members of the House Committee on Ways and Means, both majority and minority sides, with the Senate Committee on Finance, both majority and minority sides, and to make other soundings, I think I can better advise the Senator as to what possibility, if any, there is still to meet the adjournment time as of midnight tomorrow.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then the Senator has no definite information at the moment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. So far as I am concerned, with the legislation now before Congress, it is my personal belief that we can easily meet the adjournment date, by reason of the cooperation we have had from the minority side of the aisle. I wish to commend both the minority leader and other members of the minority for the very fine cooperation they have given to the acting majority leader and to other Senators on my side of the aisle.

Mr. ELLENDER. In fact, the whole Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. I am convinced that with our present legislative program, we could meet the adjournment date. But in view of more recent developments, I wish to withhold

final judgment, as of the present moment, as to whether we will meet it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6200) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, line 3, it is proposed to insert the following:

EMERGENCY MIGRATION

For expenses necessary to enable the President, by transfer to such officer or agency of the Government as may be appropriate, to carry out such migration program as may be authorized by law, including transfer of not to exceed 65 passenger motor vehicles from the Mutual Security Agency or the Department of State without reimbursement; not to exceed \$9,000 for expenses of a confidential nature, to be accounted for solely on the certificate of the officer to whom funds are transferred by the President from this appropriation; and not to exceed \$756,000 for the making of loans; \$4,000,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law, during the first session of the 83d Congress, of either S. 1917 or H. R. 6481.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. The amendment provides funds to implement the so-called immigration bill, which was passed by the Senate yesterday and is now in conference. The amount provided in the amendment is \$4 million. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a breakdown of how money will be used.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMERGENCY MIGRATION

This amendment is to put into the bill funds to carry out the provisions of H. R. 6481 which has just passed the Senate as a substitute for S. 1917 and gone to conference.

These funds will carry the program through March 31, 1954. By that time the new coordinator can justify the further needs.

The program will extend for 3 years and 8 months and cover nonquota immigrant visas to approximately 211,000 refugees, escapees, and expellees—97,000 in west Germany, Berlin, and Austria; 13,000 in NATO countries, and Trieste; 66,000 Italian refugees in Italy and Trieste; 17,500 Greek refugees in Greece; 17,500 Dutch refugees in the Netherlands—as well as 4,000 orphans and 5,000 nonimmigrant aliens in the United States.

The coordinator, to be named by the President, will allocate funds to the various agencies performing their respective functions approximately as follows: Department of State, \$2,268,000; Department of Defense, for Army Counter Intelligence Corps, \$233,000; Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for Public Health Service, \$270,000; Department of Justice for Immigration and Naturalization Service, \$180,000; Department of Labor, for Bureau of Employment Secur-

ity, \$90,000, leaving, for the direct use of the coordinator, operation expenses, \$203,000; loans funds (to private voluntary agencies for transportation and resettlement expenses), \$756,000, total of \$4 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment which I ask to have stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, line 19, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert the following:

Provided further, That nothing in sections 281 or 283 of title 18 U. S. C. or in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99) shall be deemed to apply to any person because of appointment for part time or intermittent service as a member of the International Organizations Loyalty Board in the Civil Service Commission as established by Executive Order 10422 dated January 9, 1953, as amended.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the statutes referred to prohibit persons from serving as employees of the Federal Government and at the same time prosecuting claims against the Government.

The proposed additional language will permit the Board to be staffed with some outstanding members of the legal profession who would be barred without this proviso. Similar language is contained in the "Salaries and expenses" appropriation regarding the appointment of members to the old Loyalty Board. In other words, the amendment continues for the new Loyalty Board the same exception that was made in the case of the old Loyalty Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understood the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] had an amendment to offer in which I concur. I have discussed the question with him. It pertains to buying additional new furniture.

The Senator from New Hampshire has so much on his hands at the moment, that I submit an amendment and ask that it be read. The Senator from South Dakota and I are in full accord on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 50, after line 12, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. . Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, no funds shall be available in this or any other act for the purchase of furniture by any department or agency in any branch of the Government if such requirements can reasonably be met, as determined by the Administrator of General Services, by transfer of excess furniture including rehabilitated furniture from other departments and agencies pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

Mr. BRIDGES. In my judgment, the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]

and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] presents a very constructive plan. It is a good amendment. It should save the Government money, and, as chairman of the committee, I shall be glad to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina, for himself and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. I send to the desk another amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 19, line 18, after the word "travel", it is proposed to strike out "\$250,000" and insert "\$500,000."

Mr. BRIDGES. This amount is for a new Hoover Commission. I do not know what was spent by the original Hoover Commission, which operated under the previous administration.

Mr. FERGUSON. It was \$1,900,000, less \$60,000.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then it would have been \$1,840,000. The amendment now offered will provide \$500,000 for the work of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. I certainly think it is worth while.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the scope of the new Commission is wider than that of the old Hoover Commission.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct. The scope of the new Commission is much broader. The work would be broader than that of the other Commission. Of course, it will use all the task force reports of the previous Commission and any other information they have which would be of help to the new Commission.

It will be necessary to have the amount called for in the amendment in order to organize the Commission. As I understand, the members of the Commission will be called together by the President at an early date and will begin to do their work immediately. As a member of the the Commission, I know the task confronting it.

Mr. HAYDEN. It will be necessary again to establish task forces, will it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. I send to the desk another amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 21, after line 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

SERVICE DISABLED VETERANS INSURANCE FUND

For an additional amount for "Service disabled veterans insurance fund", \$1,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Readjustment benefits," and to remain available until expended.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this is an amendment for the disabled veterans' insurance fund. It does not represent new money. It is merely a transfer of money previously appropriated. We have been informed that the transfer is necessary and the committee feels the request is proper.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 24, after line 24, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 906. In order more effectively to administer the funds appropriated to the Department of Defense, the President, to the extent he deems it necessary and appropriate in the interest of national defense, may authorize positions in the Department of Defense to be placed in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 in accordance with the procedures and standards of that act, and such positions shall be additional to the number authorized by section 505 of that act. Under authority herein, grades 16, 17, and 18, in the Department of Defense may be increased only to the extent that the total of such grades in the Department of Defense shall not exceed 215, notwithstanding the provisions of section 645 of the Defense Appropriation Act, 1954.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this amendment provides, as the language indicates, for no new jobs. It does provide for a different classification for a number of positions in the higher brackets, for administrative purposes, so that the type of man necessary can be procured.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 35, line 18, it is proposed to strike out "\$900,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,500,000."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I point out that this is salaries and expenses for the Economic Stabilization Agency carried in this bill. I should like to have the Senate understand the situation, so that there will be no misunderstanding as to what we are doing.

The Senate committee provided \$900,000. I have talked with Mr. Flemming of the General Services Administration, with General Persons, and with others regarding this particular item. Yesterday they showed me the figures as to what would be required if this agency were to close tomorrow, July 31. In order to pay terminal leave and close on July 31, \$1,144,770 would be required.

I think we are fooling ourselves if we do not handle this problem in a realistic manner. We must provide enough

money so that the agency can be liquidated. Certain parts of it can be continued, in the vitally affected areas, for the duration of the extension provided by law. The Senator from New Hampshire, without having an opportunity to talk with all the members of his committee, is offering this amendment as a result of the new information. I do not wish to assume authority which I do not have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. How much of this money is for terminal leave?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am told that if the agency were closed as of tomorrow night, and terminal leave were paid, \$1,144,770 would be required. I am told that a skeleton staff could be continued until the formal expiration date, assuming that the large group is liquidated now, for the amount which I have suggested in the amendment which I have offered, which is \$1,500,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have been approached on this subject. The present Rent Administrator is a man whom I have known for a great many years. He tells me, in answer to the same question which the Senator from Arizona has raised that, based upon actual computations, there were 866 employees on the rolls as of July 1. It would cost \$654,350 to pay off the terminal leave obligation. Most of the employees will have been separated on or before July 31. This will leave a balance of \$245,650 for all other expenses. For the month of July alone the expenses are \$308,760. So there is already a deficit when the terminal leave payments are included.

I believe the chairman of our committee is eminently correct and sound in offering the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 36, line 14, after the word "Board", it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That in addition, not to exceed \$310,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation made available under this head for the fiscal year 1953, shall remain available during the current fiscal year to cover the cost of reduction in force of officers and employees whose services are terminated.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this is not the appropriation of new money. This is the use of an unobligated balance. It is to pay terminal leave for 309 employees who have been released from their duties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, that completes the series of amendments which I have to offer.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, line 21, it is proposed to strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$7,500,000"; and in the same line it is proposed to strike out "\$700,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,300,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I am offering this amendment at the request of the Department of Agriculture. Representatives of the Department appeared before the committee in support of the original request. There is a budget estimate from Mr. Dodge, which appears on page 245 of the hearings, and which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the estimate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

"PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

"Agricultural adjustment programs

"For an additional amount for 'Agricultural adjustment programs,' \$7,500,000, of which not more than \$1,300,000 may be transferred to the appropriation account, 'Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.'"

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, requires the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the total acreage allotment of corn for any calendar year for the commercial corn-producing area which will produce, together with corn produced in the noncommercial corn-producing area, carried over, and imported, an amount equal to the normal supply. For the past several years, however, conditions have been such as to enable the Secretary to waive acreage allotments of corn, but it now appears highly probable that controls in the form of acreage allotments will be necessary on the 1954 crop to prevent the further accumulation of excessive supplies and the accompanying expenditure of excessive price-support funds. The entire farm program is being reviewed, and the proposal outlined in this submission is not an indication that such programs as the one proposed herein should be continued beyond the 1954 crop year.

The proposed supplemental appropriation would provide funds to enable the Department of Agriculture to formulate and carry out acreage allotments on the 1954 crop of corn in the commercial corn-producing area. It is necessary that preparation be started at the earliest possible date in order to meet certain statutory deadlines in implementing such controls.

I recommend that the foregoing proposed supplemental appropriation be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

Jos. M. Dodge,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for agricultural adjustment programs, \$7,500,000, of which not more than \$1,300,000 may be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938."

EXPLANATION OF LANGUAGE

Present indications are that it will be mandatory, under existing legislation, to proclaim acreage allotments on the 1954 crop of corn. It will be necessary to begin work on gathering and compiling data as soon as possible upon which to determine the commercial corn-producing area and to establish equitable acreage allotments for such area by February 1, 1954, as required by law.

Project statement

Project	Fiscal year 1954 House bill ¹	Amendment, increase (+) decrease (-)	Fiscal year 1954 amended, estimated
1. Acreage allotments and marketing quotas:			
(a) Tobacco.....	\$3,700,000	-----	\$3,700,000
(b) Peanuts.....	2,300,000	-----	2,300,000
(c) Wheat.....	13,781,000	-----	13,781,000
(d) Cotton.....	15,469,000	-----	15,469,000
(e) Corn.....	-----	+\$7,500,000	7,500,000
Total acreage allotments and marketing quotas.....	35,250,000	+7,500,000	42,750,000
2. Assistance to Selective Service.....	250,000	-----	250,000
Total estimate or appropriation.....	35,500,000	+7,500,000	43,000,000

¹ Does not include \$3 million added by Senate for measurement of cotton acreage (now pending before conference committee).

Objective: To bring the production of corn, which, under present legislation, must be supported at 90 percent of parity, more in line with normal demand to prevent the accumulation of burdensome supplies. Generally, hogs consume nearly 50 percent of all corn fed to livestock and the continuing indicated decline in pig crops probably will result in substantial decrease in demand for corn for feeding purposes.

The legislative authority for acreage allotments on corn and the apportionment thereof is contained in sections 328 and 329 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. This authority provides that the acreage allotment of corn for any calendar year shall be that acreage in the commercial corn-producing area which, on the basis of the average yield for corn for the 10 immediately preceding years subject to minor adjustments, will produce, together with corn produced in the noncommercial corn-producing area, carried over, and imported, an amount equal to the normal supply.

The problem: The 1952 crop of 3,307 million bushels, the second largest on record, will provide enough corn to meet all demands and increase the carryover reserves by about 300 million bushels. Reserve supplies of 800 million bushels are anticipated by October 1, 1953. The July BAE Crop Report indicates a 1953 crop of 3,337 million bushels. A crop of this size, together with the increased carryover, would provide a total supply of 4,137 million bushels which would be about 1,000 million bushels above the anticipated requirements for the 1953-54 marketing year. With the existing price supports maintained without regard to effect-

ing a balance between production and market outlets, production in 1954 will probably lead to the accumulation of excessive supplies in the hands of the Government. Unrestricted production in 1954 could create carryover reserves in excess of 1 billion bushels with about 75 percent held by the Government.

Plan of work: The establishment of acreage allotments will involve a considerable amount of work, such as—

1. Collecting basic data on planted acreages.
2. Reconstituting farms.
3. Contacting farmers to obtain basic farm data.
4. Computing diversion credit.
5. Determining individual farm allotments by local committees.
6. Preparing listing sheets and allotment notices.
7. Preparing allotment regulations, procedures, and forms.
8. Considering appeals.
9. Measuring farms.
10. Computing acreage.

This work will be necessary for an estimated 1,900,000 farms.

Financial requirements: It is estimated that \$7,500,000 will be required for work in connection with establishing acreage allotments on corn.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, this money is for the corn-acreage allotment program, which is mandatory under the Agricultural Act of 1938. It seems that we are to have some surplus corn. Under the present act, if there is a certain surplus it is mandatory on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture to provide acreage allotments in order to reduce the corn surplus a year from now. He has no alternative.

When the committee was marking up the bill a motion was made to reduce the appropriation to about one-half the amount requested. I went along with that motion, believing that the Department could get along with \$3 million.

I discussed the question with representatives of the Department, and with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], ranking minority member of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. Both of us feel that the Department must have the money requested to do the kind of job which is necessary in carrying out the acreage-allotment program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Congress has already provided funds for cotton and wheat acreage allotments.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amount asked here is to carry on a similar program with reference to corn.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, at the time this question was before the committee, the committee decided to reduce the amount to \$3 million. I remember very distinctly that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] took the lead in the fight to reduce the amount to \$3 million.

Mr. YOUNG. Yes; and the junior Senator from North Dakota supported the Senator from Georgia. I have since talked with him, and he believes it is

necessary to restore the full amount in order to allow the Department to do the kind of job which it must do under the law.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. THYE. If the Department does not have the funds it cannot carry out the program of preparing for acreage allotments with respect to the corn acreage reduction for the next year. If it does not carry out that program, it cannot comply with the act which is on the statute books today. So I believe it is mandatory on our part to make the necessary funds available so that the Department may carry out the law which we have previously enacted.

Mr. BRIDGES. I try to follow the instructions of my committee. Members of my committee are very intelligent and very able. When they come on the floor and reverse themselves and give a good argument, and appear in a substantial group, I will go along with their change of heart. Therefore, I am willing to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] is agreed to.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, by direction of the Subcommittee on Real Estate and Military Construction of the Committee on Armed Services, I offer an amendment and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. After line 3, page 22, it is proposed to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Naval air facilities, Cubi Point, Philippine Islands: Aircraft maintenance facilities, \$2,000,000 to be funded out of prior appropriations.

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Aircraft maintenance facilities, \$2,000,000 to be funded out of prior appropriations.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, after the military construction bill was passed the other day we were contacted by representatives of the Navy, who said that of the projects we had eliminated or deferred there were two they thought had high priority because of weather and climatic conditions. They have funds with which to carry on the project and we had expected to handle the matter in conference, but when the bill went to the House that body passed it as it was, so the only way to handle the matter is to put the appropriation in the pending bill. I discussed the subject with the members of the subcommittee and with the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from South Dakota, the chairman of the subcommittee, is correct. The Senator from New Hampshire will take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the chairman of the Com-

mittee on Appropriations to page 9, lines 18 through 23, which read:

Provided further, That, until January 1, 1954, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Director of the United States Information Agency created pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953 may terminate the employment of any person transferred to said Agency: Provided further.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, may we have order, so I may hear the Senator from South Carolina?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have examined this amendment in the appropriation bill, and it appears to give to the United States Information Agency authority and discretion not authorized by existing law. Therefore, it would amend existing law. For that reason it contravenes the rule of the Senate that prohibits legislation upon an appropriation bill. I raise the point that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. This provision in the bill the Senate has acted on three times previously; it has been ruled out of order in the case of the State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bill, and in other appropriation bills, on the ground that it violates the carefully written veterans' preference legislation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is entirely correct. We raised the point of order against similar amendments in the other bills, and the Chair ruled that they constituted legislation on an appropriation bill. For that reason, I think it clearly violates the rule.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, each time the Senate has sustained the point of order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senate refused to override the ruling of the Chair, because of its desire not to destroy by indirectness in an appropriation bill the principle of veterans' preference.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from Oklahoma is entirely correct in his statement. If we start to amend the veterans' preference law by amendments offered on the floor to appropriation bills, we will run into great difficulties. For that reason, I raise the point of order.

Mr. MONRONEY. The only people to be affected by this provision would be veterans.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They would be the only ones to be affected.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator. I am happy to join him in his point of order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from Oklahoma is making the same point of order.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a point of order has been made by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina,

joined by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. Let me explain the situation. This is a very thorny subject. For many years I have heard, times without number, Members of the Senate criticize the personnel in the Information Service. They were probably right in their criticism, in that the Information Agency seemed to have become a sort of refuge for people who did not fit anywhere else in Government. Of course there are many good people and many competent people in the Agency also. I do not want to disparage all of them. But into that group there have crept many people who do not operate for the best interests of our country.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am very deeply concerned about this particular phase of the operation of the information program. We have just finished a survey of the subject which covered the past year. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] rendered outstanding service as chairman of the subcommittee, as my predecessor. I had the privilege of serving as chairman of the subcommittee during this session of Congress. I will not speak for the Senator from Arkansas or for any other member of the subcommittee, except as the committee report speaks for itself, and it was the unanimous report of the committee. The subcommittee was completely nonpartisan—I should say unpartisan, because it consisted of 4 Democrats and 4 Republicans. It was not a subcommittee which gave the balance of power to either political party. Under the chairmanship of the Senator from Arkansas the subcommittee functioned in a completely unpartisan manner, and certainly I in my own feeble way have tried to follow in the same path.

If we found out anything about the information program, as I believe every member of the subcommittee will agree, it was that one of the greatest handicaps to the successful operation of the American information program overseas was the rigidity in employment and the fact that the Information Agency has become a catchall for misfits from other agencies.

Let me say that there are many able persons in the Information Agency. I am not criticizing all of them, of course. However, there are many square pegs in round holes throughout the program. It is impossible to get rid of them. Every director in every country and the directors in this country agree on that point. Their first complaint is, "We are handicapped by the tenure rights of persons who have been placed in the Agency. Whenever we want to change personnel or bring about a reduction in force, we cannot do it on the basis of merit. We cannot change the provision, and we cannot retain the artful people in the program. We must get rid of misfits, but they have some kind of tenure or privilege, and we are forced to keep a great many people in the program who never should have been placed in it in the first place." It is a technical program.

Our committee recommended unanimously that in this case the Director be given latitude, first, to hire some better people who would have to be paid more money, in certain positions of importance; and, secondly, that he be given the latitude and the responsibility that go with his position, in an effort to get technically-trained people to fill the highly technical positions in the agency. It is a very important job we must do in this program.

I suggest to the Senator from South Carolina that this Agency is quite unusual in that regard. The question of dissemination of information under the program, whether we call it propaganda or information, requires competence, and it requires artful operation. It is impossible to take a man who has been doing another job and, because he has tenure and has been bumped off another job, put him in the information program and say to him, "You become an information officer."

That is the major reason why our information program has not risen to the heights of success our expenditures warrant. I am convinced that the only way—not the only way, but one of the major ways by which we can correct the situation is by letting the Director select people of ability and shift them around into positions where they fit, and getting rid of people who are unfit for the jobs. They may work well in other sections of the Government, but not in connection with this program. Then we should hold the Director responsible for the results of the program. That is the only way we shall get our message to the people of the world, and it is the only way we can look forward to achieving a reasonable degree of success.

I earnestly hope the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Oklahoma will see fit not to press the point of order. I do not know whether it is valid; I have not gone into that question. But I feel very deeply that we must put this information program on a basis of proficiency and skill, rather than on a basis of tenure of office, so far as the employees of the agency are concerned. If we do not, we shall waste even more money than has been wasted in the past.

So I hope the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Oklahoma will not press the point of order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, certainly it is true that in the case of every department of the Government, some persons who might not be desirable for employment there could be gotten rid of if an amendment similar to this one were adopted and were made applicable. But I do not believe in breaking down the veterans' preference laws. Therefore, I believe I would not be true to my duty if I did not press the point of order at this time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does not the ranking minority member of the committee feel that instead of assuming omnipotence with regard to the matter of wiping out the veterans' preference, it would

have been wise for a conference to have been had with the other members?

This amendment strikes a blow—regardless of whether it is warranted—and opens the door, under the same type of argument, to destruction of veterans' rights of various kinds.

Only veterans are concerned with this matter. The same argument could be made in regard to other agencies of the Government. I do not believe this amendment should be included in an appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I feel sure that every Senator will acknowledge the wisdom of the rule of having each committee study the legislative proposals coming within its jurisdiction. Legislative proposals relating to civil-service matters certainly should be considered by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. After the committee has looked carefully into the proposal, the veterans' preference law can be amended, if necessary. But let us proceed in the regular way, by having the committees study the measures which come within their jurisdiction.

Therefore, I feel that I am upholding the Senate rule when I make the point of order, so as to have the amendment ruled out of order at this time. If in the future the taking of such action is desired, let the amendment be included in a bill which will be referred to the appropriate committee, from which it can be reported for consideration by the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me at this time?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We should realize that in this particular case, which is a special one, the testimony shows that more than 50 percent, or approximately so, of the employees of this particular Agency have been under the civil service, unless they have been specialists who, of necessity, have to be hired for a program of this type. It may be that we could resolve the entire difficulty by having the new Director—who probably will be appointed within the next 30 days—do some house cleaning. This amendment involves approximately 50 percent of the employees of the Agency. It might be that the new Director could work out the problem while following the civil-service rules.

I suspect that the employees of the Agency who come under the civil service are engaged chiefly in administrative work, rather than in writing, and so forth.

Therefore, at least in the case of the employees who are not under the civil service, when the new Director takes office, should not we make it possible for him to do the kind of job the Senator from Iowa suggests should be done?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As I understand, at the present time the amendment relates only to the employees who are under civil service.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, no.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It deals with all the employees, but the others can be dealt with anyway.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand. But the trouble is that in the past that has not happened.

Now that this Agency is to be transferred, on August 1, to the State Department, and is to be consolidated with that Department, this amendment is in the nature of a directive to the new Director, whoever he may be—and we have assurances that the men being considered for appointment to that position are top men—so that he will have a chance, in connection with the program, which has been subject to much criticism—although of course all of us want the program carried out—to do the kind of job that needs to be done.

Mr. FERGUSON. And to do it on his own, so that he will not be handicapped by rules and regulations.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I do not care whether \$200 million or \$20 million is appropriated; the Information Agency will be only as good or only as bad as the man who heads it.

Mr. FERGUSON. As well as those who help him on the project.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I understand that only about 50 percent of the employees of this Agency do not have veterans' preference.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I think the Senator from South Carolina should consider one other matter in this connection. I agree in general with what he has said about adding legislation to an appropriation bill.

But the special committee, of which I was chairman, which was created a year ago by Senate resolution, has studied this matter. It is true that it was not referred to one of the standing committees; but the special committee has considered this matter at great length, not only by means of the general surveys, but by means of special surveys in various parts of the world.

As the Senator from Iowa has said, there is agreement about the recommendation. The exemption will be for only a certain period of time, not permanently.

So this is a special case, which has been studied by the special committee which was set up for that purpose. Therefore, the matter has received consideration. So I think the amendment should be adopted.

I should like to see the organization begin with as much confidence as we can give it. I think this Agency is distinguishable from the old line agencies, because of the very nature of its work.

It inherited the old OWI, but suddenly was cut down to virtually nothing, and then was increased. Congress bears a part of the responsibility for that action. There has been great variation in the case of this Agency. At one time it was cut down to virtually nothing and then suddenly Congress increased it a great deal, almost overnight. I think it has been very badly handled. So I hope the Senate will give it an opportunity to proceed on a sound basis.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will not be thrown out on a point of order.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the different appropriation bills and the authorization bill for foreign aid and also the Armed Services bill all now contain a provision that counterpart funds, and also funds derived from the sale of materials, and also reparations, are to go under the budget. As most Senators know, there has been the most terrible abuse of these funds. They have been held in the countries abroad which are not affected by the bill. Funds in the amount of \$800 million have been wasted in woeful fashion. All the Appropriations Committee and the Armed Services Committee are asking is that the funds be carried in the budget. They belong to the United States of America. They do not belong to the foreign countries. Let us then appropriate them in the ordinary way.

For these reasons, I very much hope that the amendment will not be agreed to, because if it were it would represent the first exemption from the system or from the manner in which appropriation bills have been written. I hope these funds will be put in the budget.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I expect to propose such an amendment. The one about which the Senator from Virginia is talking now is another amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may say we are not talking about this amendment. We are talking about the personnel amendment. I happen to agree with the Senator from Iowa on that.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, one more word. I approve of the Fulbright program. I think we have probably received as much real benefit from that as from anything else we have done. But I likewise think funds to finance that program should go into the budget. When the Senator from Iowa offers his other amendment, I shall have something to say about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment confers upon the Director of the United States Information Agency authority which he does not possess under existing law. Therefore, it is general legislation on an appropriation bill, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I was hoping the Senator would withdraw his point of order. As explained by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, this is a matter of great importance. It was discussed in committee, and I believe the members of the committee were unanimous in thinking that it would be necessary for us to do something in this particular case. We must do something to improve the morale, and to increase the efficiency of the personnel and the capacity of the Information Service and Voice of America.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wonder whether we could effect a compromise which would avoid the present difficulty, by exempting all persons above the clerical level. In other words, clerks and stenographers would remain under civil service, and their preference could be preserved. But it could be made applicable to everyone above the grade of clerks and stenographers.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that the Senator would want to exempt from the amendment all personnel above a certain grade.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. My idea would be to exempt them from the operation of the amendment. It was not my idea, but I am trying to ascertain whether we can work out a compromise by which we could achieve our purpose, which obviously has to do with the professional staff.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would be willing to yield, but I do not have the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, what we are endeavoring to do at this time is to make certain that those who are instrumental in preparing the programs, assembling news and facts and any and all other pertinent information, will be trained and qualified to perform that work.

If a person were assigned to such duties, without an understanding on his part of that type of program, and without the necessary qualifications, he probably would not be rendering a service, but rather a disservice. While we are endeavoring to guard against that possibility, we must at the same time realize that a general plan of exempting all personnel in the classified service could affect those in clerical and stenographic positions. In other words, it could affect those whom it is not our purpose to affect. Clerical and stenographic personnel should be protected. The purpose we have in mind at this time is to make certain that those who are employed in the so-called classified service and in any highly technical service, including the information service and development programs, will be well qualified to discharge the duties of such positions.

Therefore, Mr. President, I believe that an attempt should be made to work out a compromise plan, whereby the clerical or administrative staff would not be put in jeopardy, but a plan which would provide that those engaged in the development of programs and the broadcasting of what we ordinarily refer to as the Voice of America, should be exempted; otherwise the entire program might be placed in jeopardy; it might well be rejected and destroyed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will yield in a moment. We have endeavored to work out a method by which we could really improve the Information Service. I desire to offer an amendment, which I shall send to the desk.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in order to get the matter

before the Senate again, so that we may act on it, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate—

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, I am asking for consideration of a new amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is a new amendment, because the other amendment has been ruled out on a point of order.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be immediately considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided further, That until January 1, 1954, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Director of the United States Information Agency, created pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953, may terminate the employment of any person above the grade of GS-7 transferred to said Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I raise no point of order on the particular amendment which the Senator from Michigan has just offered. I realize the problem which exists in this particular Agency at this time, and I feel that the amendment would protect the personnel in the lower grades. It is possible that some of those within the higher brackets may have done things they should not have done, and that they have not acted as they should have acted. The amendment would protect those in grade GS-7 and in lower grades.

A subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service made a thorough study and report entitled "Reduction in Force Procedures in the Federal Government," which recommended ways to retain our ablest employees and to insure high merit among Federal workers. But nowhere did we find it necessary to repudiate our benefits to the veterans of our country.

If we are to attack veterans' preference in this Congress, I want it attacked directly, so that the record will be clear.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal Manpower Policies, I had a study made designed to find ways of retaining our efficient and competent employees, but without destroying veterans' preference, or even amending it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, there is a matter which my colleague and I would like to present to the Senate, and particularly to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. In the civil functions bill, which was recently passed, there is a provision for planning money in the sum, I believe, of \$2,800,000. I should like to ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee whether that planning money may be used for any projects the Engineers may deem to be for the benefit of the country, and at any time they may so desire, or is it restricted only to those items listed in the civil functions bill?

Mr. BRIDGES. I would say that in the planning money which was appropriated funds were made available for certain definite projects, and they are listed, though it is a lump-sum appropriation, and there is nothing specifically in the law that would prohibit the Corps of Engineers from meeting an unusual situation if it should arise, if it could be termed an unusual situation.

I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that he and his colleague presented a very good case to the committee, but because the project had not been formally approved before it was presented, and because there were many other points raised in connection with it, the committee deferred action on it. I understand there have been some new developments. Is that correct?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. What are they?

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Public Works Committees of the House and Senate, following a full meeting of the House committee, and the Secretary of the Army, have approved this particular project as being eligible for consideration under the 1909 act, which permits the Corps of Engineers to repair and reconstruct any existing facilities. The approval by the Secretary of the Army was given yesterday.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, because of these new developments, and because this is a repair and replacement project, and not a new proposal, I shall be glad to take to conference an amendment, if the Senator will submit it.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 26, line 21, it is proposed to strike out "\$2,200,000" and to insert "\$2,300,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from Kentucky. I hope the amendment which has been offered and accepted will be maintained in conference. The approval of the two Committees on Public Works and the approval by the Secretary of the Army, it seems to me, would place this project in the category of projects which would authorize the Corps of Engineers to proceed under the 1909 act and use the planning money. I hope that will not be necessary and in conference the amendment will be approved.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, if I may propound a question to my colleague, is it not a fact that this is a project in which the savings to the Federal Treasury will, over a period of 18 years, pay the complete cost of the project?

Mr. COOPER. That has been stated by the Corps of Engineers and, I think, by the Atomic Energy Commission. I understand it is the only project of its kind in the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, let me say that both Senators from Kentucky made a very good showing before

the committee, but it involved action the committee thought it could not take because of the circumstances.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Functions, I wish to say that I think the facts presented by the two Senators from Kentucky made an overwhelming case before the Committee on Appropriations, and had they been in position to make the same case before the Civil Functions Subcommittee at the time the bill was before it, I have no doubt that the item would have been included in the civil functions bill.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I desire to thank the acting majority leader for the fine statement he has made in approving this project, and I should like to say to the Senator from Michigan that when my colleague and I appeared before the committee it was actually after the hearings were closed.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct, but the Senators did make a very good showing, and the committee was very much impressed with what they said.

MENOMINEE INDIAN TRIBE OF WISCONSIN—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2828) to amend the act of Congress of September 3, 1935—49th Statutes at Large, page 1085—as amended. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read, as follows:

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2828) to amend the Act of Congress of September 3, 1935 (49 Stat. 1085), as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same with amendments, as follows:

In Section 6, line 5, of the Senate engrossed amendment, following the words "of the tribe on the" insert the word "closing".

In Section 9 of the said amendment, strike the last sentence and insert in lieu thereof the following: "When title has been transferred, as provided in this section, the statutes, rules, and regulations of the United States or any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or any agency of either, applicable to Indians, because of their status as Indians, shall no longer be applicable to the members of the tribe."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment to the title and agree to the same.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
HUGH BUTLER,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
GEORGE A. SMATHERS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

WESLEY A. D'EWART,
WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON,
E. Y. BERRY,

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. This report relates to the bill which the Senate considered a few days ago concerning the Menominee Indians.

I understand that the House has accepted the Senate's amendments, substantially. This is a matter which the Senator discussed with both the acting majority leader and the acting minority leader a few minutes ago.

Mr. WATKINS. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6200) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "7-28-53-H," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 46, line 12, it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a colon, and the following:

Provided further, That this section and section 1415 of the act of July 15, 1952, shall not apply to foreign currencies or credits utilized under section 32 (b) (2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1641 (b) (2)).

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the amendment which the clerk has read is an amendment which exempts the exchange-of-persons program, including the Fulbright program, from the operation of the budget requirement as to the use of foreign currencies which are placed to the credit of the United States abroad.

I shall not press the amendment at the moment, because I myself am a great supporter of requiring appropriate action for the use of foreign currencies. I have believed that in this particular program consideration must be given for a longer period than 1 year.

Some language is being worked upon now by those who are strongly supporting the appropriation feature of the foreign currency program, and I believe that language will be satisfactory to all those who are interested in this particular operation.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be passed over at this time, with permission to take it up a little later, before the bill is passed, when appropriate language can be presented for submission to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 16, after line 2, it is proposed to insert the following:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1954, for "Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program, \$450,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, since the committee acted upon the budget estimate for \$900,000—that is, it acted by not providing funds—I have had word from employers of Mexican farm labor in California, Arizona, and New Mexico saying they were very much alarmed that the service under the Mexican agreement would not be rendered to farmers in that part of the United States who employ Mexicans.

As I understand the situation, \$2,800,000 was appropriated last year to carry on the service. My amendment proposes to insert in the bill half the budget estimate, which will then make the total amount appropriated \$1,820,000, or practically \$1 million less than the amount appropriated last year. But the money is absolutely essential, if the immigrant checking stations at El Centro, Calif., Nogales, Ariz., and El Paso, Tex., which is the station for west Texas and New Mexico, are to be kept open for the benefit of farmers in the Southwest who use Mexican labor, not only for vegetable growing, but also for cotton picking, and work of that kind.

Mr. FERGUSON. The committee realizes this is a serious matter, and we have given it attention. We would be willing to take the amendment to conference to see if we might work it out. The Senator from Arizona will be a member of the conference, and I am certain he can give the benefit of his knowledge to the conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17, line 19, after the numerals "1953," it is proposed the following proviso:

Provided, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 1761 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (5 U. S. C. 56), this appropriation shall be available for payment of salary to persons appointed as members of the Council during the recess of the Senate immediately following the current session.

Mr. FERGUSON. The committee has included an amount for the economic advisers to the President. They will not be named until after the close of the session. Therefore, the amendment would permit them to be paid during the period Congress is not in session, and until it reconvenes and can confirm their nominations. This is a very important matter, because the President will need the advisers. He has been reorganizing this unit, so I think the amendment should be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

ment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, line 8, after the word "sum", it is proposed to insert "of which \$300,000 may be made available to one or more private international broadcasting licensees for the purpose of developing and broadcasting, under private auspices but under the supervision of the Department of State, radio programs to Western Europe, Latin America, and Africa which programs shall be designed to cultivate friendships with the peoples of the countries in those areas, and to build improved international understanding."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The amendment authorizes the Treasury to pay up to \$300,000 for the hiring or buying of private radio facilities for broadcasting informational programs to Latin America, Western Europe, and other parts of the free world.

The House included for this purpose an amount of \$70,000. I am informed, and I hope the chairman of the subcommittee will correct me if I am in error, that the Senate committee struck out the \$70,000 and accompanying language, and inserted in the report of the committee a statement which indicated the committee's desire that a substantial amount of money, not limited to \$70,000, be used for private broadcasting facilities, which have in several instances in the past, done a most outstanding job of selling America not only in South America and Central America, but also in Western Europe. The reason I have offered the amendment is that I felt a specific figure, such as \$300,000, or up to \$300,000, within the discretion of the Agency, should be authorized and made available for this purpose.

Private agencies have done a very good job in many cases. In the past, there has been a tendency on the part of the State Department to economize on the amount of money that was being spent through other successful agencies, and to put more money into Government operations which have not been so successful.

Mr. FERGUSON. Together with other members of the committee, I realize the importance of this service. We realize also that the House provided a very small amount, which, in the opinion of the committee, was not sufficient. The language of the House provision restricted broadcasts to Western Europe and Latin America. The Senate committee felt the program should be extended, if possible, to Africa and to the Pacific.

Also it was known that a new Administrator is about to take office, and we have just adopted an amendment to give him authority to remove personnel above the grade of GS-7 from the Information Service without regard to other personnel legislation. I think a cleansing job was needed. The language will allow that to be done. We feel that this project should be studied. Personally, I do not feel that even \$300,000 is sufficient.

I believe that this money can be spent to good advantage.

Let me read from the committee report:

The committee also recommends deletion of the following language: "of which \$70,000 may be made available to one or more private international broadcasting licensees for the purpose of developing and broadcasting, under private auspices but under the supervision of the Department of State, radio programs to Western Europe and Latin America, which programs shall be designated to cultivate friendship with the peoples of the countries in those areas, and to build improved international understanding."

In striking the foregoing language, the committee recommends that the full intent and purpose of Public Law 402, 80th Congress, be applied whenever possible; it follows:

"Sec. 1005. In carrying out the provisions of this act it shall be the duty of the Secretary to utilize, to the maximum extent practicable, the services and facilities of private agencies, including existing American press, publishing, radio, motion pictures, and other agencies through contractual arrangements or otherwise. It is the intent of Congress that the Secretary shall encourage participation in carrying out the purposes of this act by the maximum number of different private agencies in each field consistent with the present or potential market for their services in each country."

If a private radio station broadcasts information and news, the people do not regard it in the same light as they regard a radio station controlled by the United States Government. Therefore we think that this is a good service, and that we would be making a mistake to follow the language of the House containing a limitation of \$70,000, and restricting the program to Western Europe and Latin America. We think it should be broader, but that the administrator should have the right to survey the program and do the job required.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am very much interested to hear the statement of the Senator from Michigan. As a member of the committee, I heard the discussion in the committee. I am glad the Senator from Iowa has offered his amendment. Personally, I hope that with the committee report and the present colloquy, his amendment may be unnecessary.

I have followed this subject over the years, and several times in the Committee on Appropriations I have offered an amendment similar to the one the Senator from Iowa has offered today. I have offered it in behalf of Station WRUL, which is the station which does most of this broadcasting. Much of this broadcasting was formerly done from Boston. There is still a transmitting station in Boston. The difficulty in the past has been that when we have included an appropriation of not to exceed \$100,000, for example, the Department of State and the information program have not used the amount which was available for private facilities.

The statute is on the books. The language is clear, and the committee feels that the new Information Service should conduct this program. I sincerely hope, as a member of the committee, and as one who has been interested in this problem over the years, that with this colloquy and the report

of the committee, it will be made clear that Congress would like to see private agencies used to as great an extent as possible. I believe they are efficient. As the Senator from Iowa has said, the people have more confidence in a privately operated station than in one operated by a Government agency. I am very glad that the Senator from Iowa brought the proposal forward.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. FERGUSON. I hope the Senator from Iowa will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan a question. Did the Committee on Appropriations generally agree that the use of private agencies in the past, where indicated, has been successful? Have they been efficient in getting information to foreign countries?

Mr. FERGUSON. The evidence has so indicated. So far as I am aware, there is no evidence to the contrary. However, there has been a feeling of apathy on the part of previous administrators. They wanted a monopoly. The committee does not agree with that attitude.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the whole trouble.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There are several private broadcasters, most of whose business is commercial, but they can accept and use some of the information program very successfully in what otherwise would be a strictly commercial operation. I know that such operations have been successful. We have found evidences of it in various parts of the world.

I think perhaps it is better not to use words of limitation, so that if the Administrator feels that he could spend \$400,000 or \$500,000 properly, he should be encouraged to do so if it is for the best interests of the program. He should not be limited to \$70,000 or \$150,000.

With that understanding, and with the statement that I earnestly hope that the Administrator will take it as the sense of this body that these facilities are to be used to a greater extent than they have been used in the past, I am happy to accommodate the Senator from Michigan and withdraw my amendment, which is one of limitation. I think the bill will be better off without it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 26, line 21, it is proposed to strike out "\$2,300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,700,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This involves the reconsideration of a committee amendment which has heretofore been amended. Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment on page 26, line 21, as amended by the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], was agreed to, is reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have discussed this question with the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the acting majority leader. This item was recommended in the Senate Appropriations Committee report on the civil functions bill. The amount there recommended was \$615,000. It is felt that \$400,000 will give us a start, and will be adequate. It is very important for the security of the harbor, in the movement of iron ore to and from Duluth and Superior.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think there is a technical change needed, because there had been prior additions to the bill. So I think the mathematics will be corrected at the desk. As I understand, the additional amount which the Senator is asking is \$400,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. \$400,000 additional.

Mr. KNOWLAND. This is in connection with a project which had gone into the civil functions bill after hearing. I will say, as chairman of the civil functions subcommittee, that the subcommittee placed it in the regular bill because it thought the project was meritorious. Speaking personally, I have no objection to having the additional \$400,000 taken to conference, to develop such additional information as is possible.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the majority leader. Let me say that this request is supported by the business community, and I believe by the Army Engineers.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, under the circumstances, and with the explanation offered, realizing that this is an important matter and should have the attention of the conference, I shall be glad to take the amendment to conference. I hope the Senate will adopt it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Michigan, and the acting majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to the committee amendment on page 26, line 21.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in connection with the amendment which I called up a moment ago, the one designated "7-28-53-A," on page 46 of the bill, referring to the question of freeing the foreign currencies which we own from the operation of the appropriations provision, the language to which I referred as being in the course of development at that time is now ready. I think the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has language which I understand is satisfactory to all concerned, and which we believe will at least meet the immediate problems in connection with the exchange-of-persons program. I therefore should like to yield to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for the presentation of the language which I mentioned.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall have to read it, because it is written in longhand and I am sure the clerk would not be able to read my writing. I will read it

slowly, and I hope accurately. It is the language which has been worked out after consultation with representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and the Comptroller General and the committee. I offer the following amendment: On page 46, line 12, strike out the period and insert a colon in lieu thereof, followed by:

Provided further, That nothing in section 1415 of the act of July 15, 1952, or in this section shall be construed to prevent the making of contracts, agreements, or executive agreements for periods in excess of 1 year, or the carrying out of any contracts, agreements, or executive agreements heretofore made for periods in excess of 1 years in any case where such contracts, agreements, or executive agreements, for periods in excess of 1 year were permitted prior to the enactment of this act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This amendment is intended to insure that the terms of existing agreements under the International Information and Educational activities, authorized by law and provided for in this appropriation, shall not be vitiated in the process of bringing the foreign currencies involved under the appropriation procedure, and that such agreements may continue to be made and carried out as heretofore for necessary periods in excess of 1 year. It requires no additional cash, and it does not disturb the proposed appropriation.

It is understood that the amount of \$8,859,791, requested for the program, and included in the \$60 million amount appropriated by the House and in the \$80 million amount recommended by the Senate committee, is retained for the program authorized by Public Law 584.

That represents the agreement of the various agencies involved.

Mr. FERGUSON. The committee was trying to keep the foreign currencies and counterpart funds under the control of Congress. It was not endeavoring to destroy the program, as the Senator from Arkansas well knows. However, we did run into the snag of how to do it in this particular case. I believe it is all important to have control over it. Therefore, with the Senator from Virginia and other Senators who are interested we have been endeavoring on all bills to keep control of the currencies through appropriations and felt that this was the right way to do it. I am glad that we have been able to work out an agreement. I recommend the adoption of the amendment, and we shall be glad to take it to conference, in the hope that the conferees will accept it as the solution of the problem. I know they are as anxious as we are to keep control of the currencies and funds involved.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan. I want to say that those administering this program never thought they were not under control. They have in this program always submitted to the Bureau of the Budget and to the committees of both Houses of Congress a precise estimate of what they were doing with the funds, and after the program of the preceding year was completed they have always submitted to Congress a complete and full statement of what was done with the money. So I certainly be-

lieve that in the administration of this particular program involving foreign currencies there has been no abuse and certainly no expenditures made as to which Congress was not fully informed. In accepting the agreement I by no means accept the possible implication, which I know is not even intended—

Mr. FERGUSON. It was not intended.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not want any implication raised that there has been any abuse of the use of foreign currency.

The limitations in the basic law authorizing the program are very clear, and they have been followed. It is distinct from programs involving counterpart funds under MSA and other programs. I do not think that at any time has this particular program been subjected to any criticism. Unfortunately all of them fall within the classification covered by the language of the so-called Rabaut amendment and section 1313 of this bill. I am relying upon the committee to defend the provision in conference. We have given up any effort to seek an outright exemption which was requested by the President and proposed in the revised budget which was intended by the amendment just withdrawn. Recognizing the point of wanting control in the other programs, we believe we have made a satisfactory compromise which I think will work satisfactorily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have one more amendment, which I send to the desk. It involves a transfer of funds under salaries and expenses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, after line 12, it is proposed to add the following:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Salaries and expenses: In addition to amounts appropriated under this head, the Administrator may transfer to this appropriation from any other funds available for administrative expenses not to exceed the sum of \$50,000 for studies and surveys which the President may request of the housing policies and programs of the Government and of organization for the administration of such programs, and for expenses of advisers and consultants in connection therewith.

Mr. FERGUSON. We are anxious to have a study made, as is the President, so that Congress may be advised on the important question of housing and public housing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, has the Senator from Michigan given any thought to providing in the pending bill that any cargo shipped under the \$200 million advanced to Korea be carried in American flag vessels, rather than in MST vessels? I do not want to suggest to the Senator anything

that would interfere seriously with the program.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not believe it should go into the pending bill with regard to the \$200 million provision. Much of the food and clothing is already over there. I believe it is a matter which should come up later. I appreciate the Senator's interest in shipping goods in American bottoms, but we could not accept such a provision in this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6200) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerks at the desk be authorized to change chapter and section numbers in order to correspond with the amendments adopted by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. MCCARRAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

EMERGENCY RELIEF FOR FRIENDLY COUNTRIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2249) to enable the President, during the period ending March 15, 1954, to furnish to peoples friendly to the United States emergency assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to make available to the President, out of stocks of agricultural commodities acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation through price support operations, such agricultural commodities as may be requested by the President for transfer (1) to any nation friendly to the United States in order to meet famine or other urgent relief requirements of such nation and (2) to friendly but needy populations without regard to the friendliness of their government providing that such commodities will be so distributed as to relieve actual distress among such populations. Not more than \$100 million (including the Corporation's investment in the commodities) shall be expended for all transfers and deliveries under this act, of which not more than \$20 million shall go to any single country. The President may make such transfers through such agencies, in such manner, and upon such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate. At least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of agricultural commodities made available under this act and transported from the United States on ocean vessels shall be so transported on United States flag vessels

to the extent practicable and to the extent such vessels are available at market rates for United States flag vessels.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of making payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities disposed of hereunder, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commodity Credit Corporation, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are equal to the Corporation's investment in such commodities, including handling costs, plus the costs incurred in making deliveries hereunder.

SEC. 3. No programs of assistance shall be undertaken under the authority of this act after March 15, 1954.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements of peoples friendly to the United States."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. HOEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMPACT BETWEEN KENTUCKY AND VIRGINIA RELATING TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A BI-STATE PARK

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall move that Calendar No. 696, Senate Joint Resolution 81, be made the unfinished business. Then I shall call up a conference report.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 696, Senate Joint Resolution No. 81.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 81) granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the establishment of a bi-State park by the States of Kentucky and Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

JURISDICTION OVER SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report see pp. 10416-10419, House proceedings of July 29, 1953, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider the report.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have been consulting with the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], who is chairman of the subcommittee which handled this bill in the Senate, and also with the Senate conferees, including the chairman of the conference committee, in regard to commencing debate on the conference report on the Continental Shelf bill. I have also discussed the matter with the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. It was suggested that we might proceed for the next half hour with the debate on the conference report. Then at 2 o'clock we shall suspend the debate on the report, in order to have the memorial services for the late Senator Tobey, of New Hampshire. When those services are concluded, we shall resume consideration of the conference report. I hope the debate which occurs thereafter will not be too prolonged.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I think it might save time if there were to be a quorum call at this time. Several Senators who should be present have had to leave the Chamber temporarily.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, I was planning to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	Martin
Anderson	Gore	Maybank
Barrett	Green	McCarran
Beall	Griswold	McCarthy
Bennett	Hayden	McClellan
Bricker	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bridges	Hennings	Monroney
Bush	Hickenlooper	Morse
Butler, Md.	Hill	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Murray
Byrd	Holland	Neely
Capehart	Humphrey	Pastore
Carlson	Hunt	Payne
Case	Ives	Potter
Chavez	Jackson	Purtell
Clements	Jenner	Robertson
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kefauver	Smathers
Douglas	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Duff	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Knowland	Sparkman
Eastland	Kuchel	Stennis
Ellender	Langer	Symington
Ferguson	Lehman	Thye
Flanders	Lennon	Watkins
Frear	Long	Welker
Fulbright	Magnuson	Wiley
George	Malone	Williams
Gillette	Mansfield	Young

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is absent because of a death in his family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2383) granting the consent of Congress to a compact between the State of New Jersey and the State of New York known as the Waterfront Commission Compact, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 40) favoring the placing of the inscription "United States of America" on containers of American-made goods for export.

The message further announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 290) creating a committee to assist in the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the Congress of 1754, held at Albany, N. Y., on June 24 of that year, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 5141. An act to dissolve the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to establish the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5246. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5256. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the retirement of judges of the Tax Court of the United States;

H. R. 5471. An act making appropriations for the government of District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5805. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch and the judiciary branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5877. An act to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and related laws, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5969. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION PLACED ON CALENDAR

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 290) creating a committee to assist in the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the Congress of 1754, held at Albany, N. Y., on June 24 of that year, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

THE ADMINISTRATION PROTECTS THE CIVIL-SERVICE WORKER

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, recently George M. Moore, a member of the United States Civil Service Commission, discussed the administration's posi-

tion with regard to civil-service workers, before the American Federation of Government Employees on Friday evening, July 24, 1953.

In this statement Commissioner Moore reviews the achievements of this administration in the civil-service field during the first 6 months following the inauguration of President Eisenhower.

As chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee I am proud of the steps we have been able to take during the past 6 months to strengthen our civil-service system. President Eisenhower has, on several occasions, stated very definitely his support of a strong civil-service system.

During the past 6 months there has been considerable concern among our classified civil-service employees as to the security of their positions. I think the record speaks for itself when we note that 86 percent of the total Federal employment was under the competitive-career system on January 20, and 86 percent is under the competitive-career service as of now.

It is true that a reduction in force and the process of bumping—which is most unfair in many instances—has resulted in hardship to many of our civil-service workers. This, of course, is unavoidable when Federal agencies are being ordered to reduce their personnel or existing agencies are eliminated. This program has been largely eased by actions taken by the Civil Service Commission.

Thirty-five thousand Federal employees who were affected by a reduction in forces since January have been placed by the Civil Service Commission, and as of this date, less than 1,000 career employees have not been reestablished in positions. This is a record one can be proud of and certainly demonstrates this administration's interest in the career worker.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONER GEORGE M. MOORE BEFORE THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES JULY 24, 1953

I consider this occasion most appropriate to report to you the achievements of the administration in the civil-service field during the first 6 months following the inauguration of President Eisenhower.

In strengthening the Federal civil service, it is reassuring to know that the Civil Service Commission and the administration has the full cooperation and support of your fine American Federation of Government Employees.

First, the Commission recommended, Congress approved, and the President signed legislation repealing the leave rider which was enacted over 2½ years ago.

Second, the arbitrary dismissal authority which had hung over the heads of Federal employees for 3 years in the Department of Commerce, and for 6 years in the Department of State, was repealed by Congress.

Third, the Commission strongly recommended the repeal of the Whitten amendment which has been in effect for over 2½ years. Today I was advised by Chairman Ep H. REES that he intends to appoint a subcommittee to consider legislation repealing the Whitten amendment.

Fourth, under Executive Order 10450 a new and realistic security program has been initiated which will protect the Government and at the same time guarantee the rights of Federal employees against arbitrary dismissal.

Fifth, the Commission has taken positive action to correct inequities arising in cases where employees have been denied civil-service status by reason of past administrative error. Also, the Commission will shortly recommend to the President the issuance of an Executive order which will correct other administrative errors now beyond our authority for appropriate action.

Sixth, Congress has authorized the Post Office Department, whose payroll exceeds 500,000 employees, to establish a central Personnel Division under the direction of an Assistant Postmaster General for Personnel.

Seventh, the Commission recommended, Congress approved, and the President has signed legislation protecting civil-service rights of Korean veterans who lost opportunity for Government employment by reason of service in the Armed Forces.

Eighth, the Commission has recommended and the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has approved three important amendments to the Veterans Preference Act which will improve the operation of the civil service and protect the rights of veterans. This legislation provides that veterans must receive a passing grade before they are entitled to preference; that disabled veterans must have a compensable disability before they are entitled to an additional 10 points on examinations; and that the findings of the Civil Service Commission as to sufficiency of the reasons for passing over a veteran shall be mandatory on the departments and agencies.

Ninth, an overall study of the Retirement Act conducted by a committee of experts will be completed by June 30, 1954, to determine in what respects the Retirement Act should be amended or can be liberalized.

Tenth, the Commission has begun a program to raise the qualifications standards for persons entering the Federal service. The first project was to devise new and improved examinations for positions of Postmaster and Director and Deputy Director in the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Eleventh, under a new displaced career employee program effective June 1, of the 35,000 Federal employees who have been affected by reductions in force since January, less than 1,000 career employees have not yet been placed. I anticipate that within 60 days nearly all of these deserving and qualified career employees will be placed in vacancies or, where necessary, in positions now occupied by employees with indefinite status.

Twelfth, 56 percent of the total decrease in the Federal payroll since January, which has resulted in an estimated overall annual savings of \$300,000,000, has been accomplished without the forced separation of a single Federal employee.

Thirteenth, an Executive order has established a policy of clearly defining positions in the Government which are policy determining or confidential in nature. This new category, known as schedule C, now includes 318 positions, only 35 of which have been transferred from the competitive service. The Commission has rejected or closed out 55 schedule C requests from departments and agencies. At present there are pending agency requests to place 771 positions in schedule C.

Fourteenth, the Commission has recommended the enactment of legislation which will abolish the so-called CPC schedule. This will provide greater opportunities for the 122,000 employees in this schedule who will be transferred under the Wage Board system or under the general schedule classification. The enactment of this legislation will simplify and improve the administration of the

Classification Act, and I anticipate that the Congress will approve such legislation.

Fifteenth, for the first time in the history of our country the President has recognized the importance to Federal employees of having the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission act as his personal adviser and representative on personnel matters.

In my opinion, this is a record of which you can be proud. These are constructive actions. Under the dynamic leadership of our President, we have all put our shoulders to the wheel. We know that President Eisenhower is firmly convinced that it will be only through a strong and progressive civil service merit system that our Government can meet the challenges of this atomic age.

I know of no better way of judging the present than by comparison with the past. I have outlined what has happened during the first 6 months of this administration. Let us compare this record with what happened in the days, months, and years following March 4, 1933.

On June 30, 1933, 80 percent of the Federal employees were in the competitive career service. By June 30 of the following year this percentage had dropped to 67 percent and by June 30, 1936, 39 percent of the positions in the Federal Government were being filled on a spoils system basis and only 61 percent of the total Federal employment was in the competitive career service.

While our critics are trying "to put a camel through the eye of a needle" and see dire consequences in action which has been taken to improve the administration of the Government and to make it responsive to the mandate of the people, let us remember what happened 16 years ago. In fact, things were so bad in those days that in 1937 the annual report of the Civil Service Commission contains this statement:

"During the past year friends of the merit system in Congress have had to maintain a constant struggle to prevent a complete triumph of the spoils system. All too frequently the efforts against its encroachments have been ineffective."

Compare this with the record of the last 6 months. Eighty-six percent of the total employment was under the competitive career system on January 20, and 86 percent is under the competitive career service tonight.

With all of the conviction at my command, I tell you that it is the sincere desire of President Eisenhower that history will not repeat itself.

We are now engaged in analyzing that hodge-podge of positions—222,000 of them—in schedule A, which were not filled on a competitive basis, and we shall transfer those positions to the competitive service which properly belong there.

In my opinion, when the record of achievements in the civil service field is written a year from now, the 86 percent of total Federal employment in the competitive service will not only be maintained but increased.

ESTABLISHMENT OF REVOLVING FUND WITHIN CONTINGENT FUND OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I report favorably from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 316), and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 316) establishing in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund within the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES W. TOBEY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I send to the desk an order of the Senate, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the order.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the legislative business of the Senate be now suspended, in order that memorial addresses may be delivered on the life, character, and public service of the late Senator from New Hampshire, Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I was shocked upon learning of the death of my colleague, CHARLES W. TOBEY, Senator from New Hampshire. Senator TOBEY died on Saturday, July 25, and was laid to rest on Tuesday last in his home town of Temple, N. H.

As a member of the delegation of Senators to the simple yet impressive service, I was reminded by those quiet surroundings that Senator TOBEY was a man of humble origin who rose in the true American spirit to positions of national prominence as an elected public official.

Senator TOBEY did not have the opportunity for extended formal education; however, it may be said that his quest for education and learning never ended. He is remembered as one of the most widely read and well-informed Members of this body.

Senator TOBEY began his political career of service to the people of his town, his State, and his Nation when he was first elected to the board of selectmen in Temple, N. H. From that beginning, he was successively chosen for many offices of public trust, and in his long career as a candidate for public office he had the distinction of never having been defeated for an elective office.

After beginning his career as a town official in his home community, CHARLES W. TOBEY was sent by his neighbors to represent them in the New Hampshire General Court. Here he served for three terms, and that body, which, as my colleagues may know, is the third largest English speaking deliberative body in the world, honored him by electing him as speaker of the New Hampshire House of Representatives in 1919.

Leaving his home State he then came to Washington for Federal service in World War I to work with President Herbert Hoover, who was then Food Administrator.

Returning to New Hampshire he was again chosen to represent the people of his neighborhood and sent to the New Hampshire State Senate. He was elected president of the New Hampshire State Senate in 1925, during the administration of Gov. John G. Winant. In 1929, after having served successively as a town official, a State representative, speaker of the New Hampshire House,

a State senator and president of the New Hampshire Senate, he was elected Governor of the State of New Hampshire.

After serving his State so well he was elected by the people of New Hampshire to the United States House of Representatives and served in that body during the 73d, 74th, and 75th Congresses.

In 1938 the people of New Hampshire elevated CHARLES W. TOBEY to the United States Senate. He was then reelected to the Senate in 1944 and 1950. Perhaps one of the greatest tributes to Senator TOBEY occurred in his campaign for the Senate in 1938, when he received every vote cast in his hometown of Temple, N. H.

The personal characteristics of Senator TOBEY, which are well known to his friends in New Hampshire and to the Members of the Senate, drew the attention of the American public at the time of the Senate Crime Committee's investigation. His forthright opposition to organized crime in all its ramifications became known throughout the country. He received letters from people throughout America who drew inspiration and courage from his verbal duels with the racketeers and underworld characters.

Senator TOBEY served the people of New Hampshire and the Nation on many occasions. It is not necessary to detail his legislative accomplishments, as the record will forever preserve the extent and value of his contributions to the deliberations of the Congress.

Among the many accomplishments which dot the career of this public official, Senator TOBEY is remembered particularly for his participation as a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations Monetary Conference at Bretton Woods, N. H. He won fame and additional national recognition for his fearless participation as a member of the Senate Crime Committee. More recently Senator TOBEY served this country as United States adviser to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization Conference in Paris.

It is normal in the processes of our republican form of government for men to differ on the solutions to public problems. All of us who served with Senator TOBEY recognized that he was a zealous advocate of the causes in which he believed. He was outspoken in his beliefs and presented his points of view with conviction and eloquence.

Just a few brief days ago, in what we now realize was the twilight of his long career, Senator TOBEY sat with us in extended and strenuous deliberations, giving of his time and energy as though he were a man of much younger age. He exemplified to the last those fundamental characteristics by which he was known. He was religious, patriotic, and a determined crusader for what he conceived to be right.

Mr. President, with the unexpected death of my colleague Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, of New Hampshire, my State, my colleagues in the Senate and the peo-

ple of the Nation have suffered a great loss. I again extend to Mrs. Tobey and to his family my sincere and deep sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I find it extremely difficult to find words capable of describing the feeling I had at learning of the death of CHARLES TOBEY. Senator TOBEY was such a unique person, such an outgoing individual that it is hard to believe that he has left us. In at least one sense he has not finally left us, for all of those who knew him will long remember his strong personality and his influence and example will remain with us.

Only a week or so ago the Senate ratified the New York-New Jersey waterfront compact designed to correct the intolerable conditions which Senator TOBEY's committee uncovered among longshoremen on the waterfronts of these States. Senator TOBEY's invaluable cooperation was in large measure responsible for securing the prompt ratification of that compact.

My colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and the two Senators from New York [Mr. Ives and Mr. LEHMAN] join me in expressing appreciation of the fact that when Senator TOBEY heard that the compact was pending he immediately called his committee together and obtained prompt action on the compact. In a matter of only a day or two the compact, which had been initiated by Governor Driscoll of New Jersey and Governor Dewey of New York, was approved by the Senate and sent to the House. It was an evidence of Senator TOBEY's way of doing things when he had something to do which he felt was right. I expect the compact to go a long way toward correcting the New York-New Jersey waterfront conditions and should it prove as successful as I expect, it will be a fitting tribute to his energy, honesty, and devotion to public service.

It has been said before, and it will be said many times again, that CHARLES TOBEY was a real Christian who daily practiced the great Christian principles in which he so firmly believed. None of us will soon forget his remarkable ability to draw forth a Biblical quotation applicable to the situation of the moment. It is said that in his childhood he began reading a chapter of the Bible each day and that he continued this practice throughout his lifetime. I do not doubt that this habit of his had a profound influence on the fine life he led.

I had the great privilege of serving with CHARLES TOBEY on the Foreign Relations Committee, and through this and other work came to know him well. He was one of those fine characters who make an indelible impression on all with whom they come in contact. We shall miss greatly his warm personality and his abounding sense of humor.

Mrs. Smith joins me in extending deepest sympathy to Mrs. Tobey and the other members of his family.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I rise to pay a word of tribute to one of the most energetic, the most forceful, and the

most dynamic personalities who was ever a Member of the United States Senate. CHARLES W. TOBEY possessed deep, personal convictions, to which he clung uncompromisingly. His ready wit and rare humor sparked in many a debate and tempered many a controversy. In his passing the United States has lost a truly great citizen and everyone of us has lost a genuine personal friend. I join in extending heartfelt sympathy to his bereaved family.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to add my brief word of tribute to a friend, CHARLES TOBEY, who last week passed on in the journey which we all must take. We came to the Senate together, CHARLES and I, together with BOB TAFT and several others, back in January 1939.

I came to know CHARLES TOBEY from two particular vantage points. I served with him on the Committee To Investigate Crime in Interstate Commerce. I journeyed with him to various cities, including a memorable west coast trip which included Nevada and California.

At that time, I came to know particularly at first hand, his crusading zeal, his burning desire for an America free of the stain of crime and corruption.

Then, too, for many years it was my privilege to serve with him while we were members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, including the past 6 months, while I have been chairman of that committee. In all my contacts with him I found him to be a man eager to fight for the right as he saw it. He was a man of steadfast independence. He was truly an individualist. One cannot point to anyone else and say that he resembles CHARLES TOBEY. He was a character. As has been said, he was a man of wit and learning who enlivened many a hard legislative session with a quip which relieved men's tensions. He was an intriguing personality, a colorful character, a lively, dynamic exponent of strong views, and he did not hesitate to express them.

He was a man with profound Christian dedication. He was a man with a deep knowledge of the Holy Scriptures. He was always able to point out some relevant passage of holy writ, as a source of inspiration for meeting a problem at hand.

He was a typical New Englander on whom the characteristics of that plain-spoken, simple-living, hard-working region had made its imprint.

As stated by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] so well today, for 40 years in public life, he served his State with distinction in virtually every post of local, State, and national significance with which a commonwealth can honor its son.

I know that I speak the heartfelt sentiments of the Senate in conveying deepest condolences to his dear wife and family.

I know that they will be sustained by the abiding spiritual faith which was his. I believe this little verse which has given me comfort, and which I have passed on to others, will give comfort

to them, as it has to others under such circumstances:

DEATH IS A DOOR
(By Nancy Byrd Turner)

Death is only an old door,
Set in a garden wall,
On gentle hinges it gives at dusk,
When the thrushes call.

Along the lintel are green leaves,
Beyond, the light lies still,
Very willing the weary feet,
Go over that sill.

There is nothing to trouble any heart,
Nothing to hurt at all;
Death is only a quiet door,
In an old wall.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, it was with heavy heart that I learned of the sudden passing of CHARLES TOBEY, our distinguished and lovable colleague from New Hampshire. Esteemed and respected by Members on both sides of the aisle for his ability and devotion to duty, and loved for his sharp Yankee humorisms which flavored so many of his discussions, his death comes as an irreparable loss to all who have had the privilege of working with him.

It has been my honor to serve with him on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce as well as the Subcommittee Investigating the Waterfronts, and I can say that CHARLES TOBEY was a man of great personal courage, a perspicacious lawmaker, and a God-fearing, loyal, American citizen of the old school. His ethical and moral principles represented the highest tradition of our American heritage and he reflected these principles in everything he said and did.

We shall miss him. We shall miss his geniality and humor. We shall miss the benefit of his great experience and cautious guidance which is so necessary in these critical times. We shall miss the services of this honorable man whose loyalty and devotion to our Nation is equaled by few.

I wish to extend my deepest sympathies to Mrs. Tobey and members of the family in their great loss, for it may be said "In very truth, he was the noblest work of God—an honest man."

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, in the Book of Job, it is written, "The Lord gave, and the Lord has taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord."

So, my colleagues, as we today mourn the death of CHARLES TOBEY, let us remember that our sorrow is an earthly thing—but that our tribute to a great American and a great Christian is all in the name of the Lord.

Our Heavenly Father had indeed touched CHARLES WILLIAM TOBEY—as He touches us all—but in the case of our departed friend, the Lord's touch was seized and reciprocated, for this man was truly His disciple, dedicated to a living Christianity and armed with His righteous wrath.

Theodore Roosevelt once said that—

No man is worth his salt who is not ready at all times to risk his body, to risk his well-being, to risk his life, in a great cause.

Gentlemen of the Senate, CHARLES TOBEY was a man who was worth his salt and gave his all.

Never at any period of his long and faithful service to the people of his State and Nation did he consider risk to his body, his well-being, or his life.

His devotion to duty was first in his many productive years of effort.

Mr. President, I first came to know intimately of CHARLES TOBEY's character back on what must have been for him a lonely day in September of 1940.

Upon that occasion he rose on the floor of the Senate of the United States and had this to say:

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, there come times where matters of the greatest import are so serious, when things which are done are so pregnant with ill for the American people, that I believe we have to talk frankly, tremendously frankly, and that is what I propose to do, whether it is liked or not. I am built that way.

It is not a pleasant thing for me to do here today.

He then went on to quote from a passage of Scripture:

He that doeth evil hateth the light. Neither goeth he to the light because his deeds are evil.

Mr. President, the occasion of Senator TOBEY's address to the Senate on that day of yester-year was in connection with an investigation by a Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures which had set out to probe the evils and abuses of our election system in New Jersey.

I was then a State senator—and we needed so badly inspiration and leadership at the national level, for the control of the State was in iron hands; even our high courts were dominated politically.

CHARLES TOBEY came to New Jersey and with his fearless vigor confronted the powerful machines of that era with a result that will live long in the history of our State.

So on this occasion in 1940 when CHARLES TOBEY took the floor of the Senate to speak out in words of utter frankness, he said what he said because he believed he was being silenced at a time when the people of New Jersey and the Nation needed to know the hard facts.

Mr. President, it is a touching thing for me, personally, in evaluating this inspired man's life from my own experience, to realize that just about the last thing he did in his life on the floor of the Senate, which he loved, was to speak out once again against crime in my own State.

Crime of the waterfront this time, Mr. President, another year, another form of crime, another set of faces, another set of circumstances, but crime in my own State, and crime at which he was characteristically striking with the up-raised fist of a servant of God placed upon this earth to bring His word to dark places and His reforms to a land which needed to be rid of its evil.

This last act in the Senate of which I speak related to the joint attempts of the Senators from New Jersey and from

New York to achieve quick passage of a Waterfront Commission compact conceived by the Governors of our two great States and approved by our State legislatures.

So, Mr. President, here was the junior Senator from New Jersey, 13 years after the time when as a State senator he first knew of TOBEY the reformer, listening on the floor of the Senate, for the last time, to this same voice berating the racketeers of the waterfront and urging passage of the waterfront compact, as he said, and I quote him:

For two great States and as a service to the American public—for after all we are all one—e pluribus unum—the time has come for cleaning up the deplorable conditions in our ports.

And, Mr. President, the compact between the States designed to eradicate the evils of the waterfront was promptly approved.

I would say to my colleagues that there can be no greater epitaph insofar as the State of New Jersey's bond with CHARLES TOBEY is concerned, and insofar as the junior Senator of New Jersey's personal bond with that statesman is concerned, than to reflect upon the coming and going of the passing parade of his days as they reflected my own personal experience with his steadfast belief in the laws of right and righteousness.

CHARLES TOBEY was a hard-working, self-made, and self-disciplined man.

He served his State brilliantly as a member of the New Hampshire House of Representatives and as speaker of its house; as a State senator and as president of the senate; as its Governor; as a Congressman and as a thrice-elected United States Senator.

There are few, indeed, with so great a record of service to his State and his Nation.

But, Mr. President, it is not the cold record alone that bespeaks of this man's dedicatory spirit.

It lies in the recollection of the clenched fist; the hammerlike thrust as he drove his point home; the flashes of rare wit—always augmented by classical phrases from the great writers and philosophies of the rich historic past; and above all, his singleness of purpose that an honest and fearless job must be done in the vineyards of the Lord, where he now labors no more, but rests.

Senator TOBEY was never truly a party man. He was a patriot first. His country came far ahead of party or success in political life.

He lived with his conscience and with his God. God was first before country with him, and the two were inseparably intertwined, as should be the creed of all who profess to be Americans.

CHARLES TOBEY will live in history as a great American. His record in this body will endure throughout the years as a symbol of progressive action—not of cold text and printed word alone, but of a living, flaming spirit placed here by his God, with a mission and a calling from which he never flinched.

He has gone to a rich reward; of that there is no doubt.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Mrs. Hendrickson, I extend deepest sympathy to Senator TOBEY's family.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Senate and the Nation have suffered a grievous loss in the untimely passing of our dear friend, CHARLES W. TOBEY, of New Hampshire. He was a great American—a simple man, a good man, a kindly man, who was deeply dedicated to the good of our country. His whole life was marked by sacrifice and by extraordinarily useful service to his State and to his country.

Few men are given the opportunity to render such varied and valuable service. He was a member of the New Hampshire Legislature; he was president of the New Hampshire Senate; he was Governor of his State; he was a Member of the National House of Representatives, and finally he was a leading Member of the United States Senate, to which he came 15 years ago, and in which he served with great distinction for 3 terms. He discharged the important responsibilities attached to all these and other offices which he held with rare fidelity and devotion and great skill. In the Senate he gained the love and admiration of his colleagues in both parties, who recognized his uncompromising honesty both in public and private life and the kindness of his spirit. His boundless energy and leadership were devoted to countless good causes which knew no limitations of race, creed, color, or national origin, and he never wavered in desire to help others.

I am confident that his forthright and uncompromising stand against the evil forces of our day and against entrenched crime and corruption will place him among the honored figures of our generation.

Mr. President, it was typical of his unselfish devotion to duty that he continued to work for his country with great steadfastness to the very end of his days. It can truly be said of him that he died in the frontline of high public service.

Mr. President, I know that I speak not only for myself, but also for all other Members of the Senate, when I say that we will miss CHARLES TOBEY not only as a colleague and a valued associate, but also as a dear friend.

On behalf of Mrs. Lehman and myself I extend heartfelt sympathy to our dear friend's family.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have seen this body shocked at the sudden departure of a colleague, but never have I seen the Senate so shocked as it was on last Saturday, when the full impact of CHARLES TOBEY's death hit us squarely. I arrived in the Chamber a few minutes after the session began. The Chamber was full; almost every Member was in his seat. Many of the Members had tears in their eyes. Senators grieved for this good man because they understood him and loved him for what he was.

For many years I had the good fortune to serve with CHARLES W. TOBEY on the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. All of us rejoiced when he was named chairman of

that powerful committee. He was considerate of our problems, and was always ready to help us solve them. On many occasions when I asked him for some special favor, he would reply, "Yes, dear friend."

CHARLES TOBEY was naturally a crusader. When he saw that something was wrong, he felt impelled to correct it; he would not tolerate it. It was not in his makeup to be tolerant of evil. He simply had to do something about it.

No one could be more patient, considerate, gentle, and generous with his colleagues than was this good man.

I pray that the Master, whom Senator TOBEY served so faithfully, may in His mercy comfort and bless Senator TOBEY's beloved wife, his devoted children, and his lively grandchildren. His family, his neighbors, and his country have suffered a great loss.

Mr. President, we laid Senator TOBEY to rest in the beautiful hills of his beloved New Hampshire, among the friends who understood him and loved him for the splendid, upright, humble, lovable man he was. When we bid him farewell, every one of us who journeyed to Temple, N. H., felt that we had been strengthened and fortified by the close contacts which it had been our privilege to have with him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on this memorial occasion I rise to speak a few brief words in tribute to CHARLES TOBEY.

He was born in Boston, in Roxbury. He received his education there. At an early age he went to work as a bank messenger.

I came to know some of the details of his early life as a result of talking with him across the table in the Senate dining room. He told me of the visits my father made to the bank, where young Charlie ran errands for him. I learned of the eagerness with which, one day, when he found my father's umbrella, he returned it to him, at his office.

Later CHARLES TOBEY moved to New Hampshire. As a New Hampshire man, he joined one of the old Boston banking firms. He worked with that firm for a number of years, until he entered politics.

He was a typical New Englander. He loved the hills, trees, and old stone walls of New Hampshire. On many occasions in the Senate I have talked with him about the apple blossoms on the hill behind his house. He said he did not know how many more years remained to him, but he never wished to miss apple-blossom time in New Hampshire.

I knew him when he was Governor of New Hampshire, when he was a Member of the United States House of Representatives, and later when he became a United States Senator. He was a much-sought-after speaker and it was my pleasure to hear him address many banquets in Boston.

He always surprised me in two ways. First, I think he could put more words into 1 minute than could any other man I have ever listened to. Yet at the same time he spoke so clearly that those who listened to him understood what he was

talking about and understood the points he was making.

The second surprising thing about him was his fund of information. He frequently quoted the Bible and various authors, classic and modern. He had a great store of information as a result of his experience in local, State, and national politics.

In Washington, I came to know him better as an eager worker, a man full of humor, a man of courage, a man who took great pride in his independence of thought and action. He had the same eagerness and the same ability to speak quickly and to the point up to his last day on the floor of the Senate, when he stood in the center aisle and asked questions about the issue then under discussion.

We shall miss him greatly in Washington, and he will also be greatly missed in New England.

I join all my family in sending to his family deepest sympathy in their great loss.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I join in the tributes to our late colleague and friend, CHARLES W. TOBEY. I shall always cherish the privilege of having served in the Senate with him, and the memory of the generous friendship he gave me.

There was no equivocation in CHARLES TOBEY. Strong in deep convictions and steadfast in high principles, he stood foursquare; he spoke out bravely and forthrightly; and he had the courage to stand alone.

CHARLES TOBEY hated wrongdoing, either in high or in low places. The thunderbolts of wrath he hurled against the wrongdoers still reverberate over this land.

He was a fighter for truth, justice, and right dealing. He believed in the people, and he was their champion. He fought their battles. His faith was in his God; and there was in his soul the gospel of humanity.

He never participated in debate on this floor without bringing light and wisdom to his cause. How often have we seen him demolish an argument with his flashing wit or, again, with inspired words from Holy Scripture.

CHARLES TOBEY was a loyal friend, a crusader for righteousness, a warrior for the people's rights and their welfare, a great American. We shall sorely miss him. When he passed away, Valiant-for-Truth crossed over to the other side.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I rise to fulfill a promise made by me to our late colleague. A few weeks ago, when news came of the passing of Senator Willis Smith, of North Carolina, I was sitting in the Foreign Relations Committee room with the late Senator TOBEY. We were discussing the unfortunate news. As is wont on such occasions, the discussion turned on the transitory nature of human existence, and I quoted a verse from the well-known poem by William Knox: "Oh, why should the spirit of mortal be proud?" Senator TOBEY said, "Guy, if I should pass on while you are still in the Senate, and the boys gather in the Senate to say nice things about me, I want you to promise me that

you will recite that poem." Thoughtlessly, I promised. Thoughtfully, I shall endeavor to comply, as well as my memory serves me:

OH, WHY SHOULD THE SPIRIT OF MORTAL BE PROUD?

Oh, why should the spirit of mortal be proud?
Like a swift-fleeting meteor, a fast-flying cloud,

A flash of the lightning, a break of the wave,
Man passeth from life to his rest in the grave.
The leaves of the oak and the willow shall fade,

Be scattered around, and together be laid;
And the young and the old, and the low and the high
Shall molder to dust and together shall die.

The hand of the king that the scepter hath borne;
The brow of the priest that the miter hath worn;
The eye of the sage, and the heart of the brave,
Are hidden and lost in the depth of the grave.

The saint who enjoyed the communion of heaven;
The sinner who dared to remain unforgiven;
The wise and the foolish, the guilty and just,
Have quietly mingled their homes in the dust.

So the multitude goes, like the flowers or the weed
That withers away to let others succeed;
So the multitude comes, even those we behold,

To repeat every tale that has often been told.
For we are the same our fathers have been;
We see the same sights our fathers have seen;
We drink the same stream, and view the same sun,
And run the same course our fathers have run.

The thoughts we are thinking our fathers would think;
From the death we are shrinking our fathers would shrink;
To the life we are clinging they also would cling;

But it speeds for us all, like a bird on the wing.
They loved, but the story we cannot unfold;
They scorned, but the heart of the haughty is cold;

They grieved, but no wall from their slumbers will come;
They joyed, but the tongue of their gladness is dumb.

They died, aye, they died; and we things that are now,
Who walk on the turf that lies over their brow,

Who make in their dwelling a transient abode,
Meet the things that they met on their pilgrimage road.

Yea, hope and despondency, pleasure and pain,
We mingle together in sunshine and rain;
And the smiles and the tears, the song and the dirge,

Still follow each other, like surge upon surge.
'Tis the wink of an eye, 'tis the draught of a breath,

From the blossom of health to the paleness of death,
From the gilded salon to the bier and the shroud—

Oh, why should the spirit of mortal be proud?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is with a sense of sorrow and a feeling of personal loss that I join my colleagues in their remarks upon the passing of CHARLES TOBEY, late a Senator from the State of New Hampshire. I did not know

Senator TOBEY very long, nor did I know him well; but I knew him sufficiently well to recognize his honesty, his courage, and his hatred of hypocrisy.

The State of New Hampshire has suffered a great loss, the Nation has been bereft of a magnificent American, and this body has cause to mourn one of its outstanding Members at a time when men like Senator TOBEY are needed so badly.

To Mrs. Tobey and the family of the late Senator I extend my deepest sympathy. In view of the upright Christian life CHARLES TOBEY led, I am assured that he is now with One who has His arms around him, and that he has found a place where there is no war, where there is no trouble, but only peace; the peace he fought so hard to achieve on earth, a peace which he now so justly deserves. May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I think every Member of this body perhaps recalls very distinctly some incident which occurred on the day of his entrance to this body. That is certainly true in my case. On the day I took the oath as a Senator, January 3, 1941, I carried with me a letter from a mutual friend, then living in Nebraska, introducing me to CHARLES TOBEY. From that day on Senator TOBEY and I were friends; and our friendship grew through the years.

I recognized CHARLES TOBEY to be a man possessing high moral principle and Christian gentleness. No one who served with him can forget his unwavering devotion to his fine code of honesty. The poet Shelley once said:

Life, like a dome of many-colored glass,
Stains the white radiance of eternity.

I am certain that life left CHARLES TOBEY as it came to him—pure of heart and soul. My deep and sincere sympathy is extended to Mrs. Tobey and his family, his friends, to the people of New Hampshire, and to the Nation, whom he so faithfully served.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of a great man, a warm-hearted friend, and a fine public servant.

I first knew CHARLES TOBEY when I was a Member of the House of Representatives. He was in the House when I began my service there. Not many years after that, he went to the Senate, and some years later I came to the Senate. One of the committees to which I was assigned was the Banking and Currency Committee of which CHARLES TOBEY was chairman. Still later, when the Senate Small Business Committee was organized, I was named as chairman of that committee, and he was designated as the ranking minority member.

Still later it was my privilege to serve with him on the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I am proud of the association and the relationship I have had the privilege of enjoying with that great and good man.

CHARLEY TOBEY was a man who could be stern in his discipline and could be harsh to him who deserved harsh and stern treatment. He could be very stern with the hardened criminal or anyone guilty of wrongdoing, but, at the same

time, he had a heart that was big and warm and kind.

I well recall when he was chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee a woman came before that committee with some small children. I do not remember how it happened that they were there, but their presence had to do with some proposed legislation. They told a story of hardship, of struggle, and of destitution. I remember that CHARLEY TOBEY, the chairman of the committee, with tears streaming down his cheeks, called on the people in the room to make a donation to help that woman and her children. He led the way by making a large contribution himself.

It was my privilege, Mr. President, to go with other Members of the Senate on the sad mission early this week to commit the remains of CHARLEY TOBEY to rest in the hills of his beloved New Hampshire.

I was glad to see the place he called home, to see the church in which he worshipped, to hear the comments of his preacher, his neighbors, and his friends. Somehow, Mr. President, I felt that I could see in the strength and clarity of those New England hills something of the rugged and fine character of CHARLEY TOBEY. I felt that he was the kind of man about whom anyone would say, "Here was a man."

I remember when I was studying Latin in college the fine old Latin professor called the attention of the class one day to the fact that there was no word in Latin which meant "He has died," but, instead, the Latin language had a phrase which meant "He has lived."

So I think of CHARLEY TOBEY. He has lived, and he has left his mark.

Mr. President, I can think of no one who could go forth into the Great Unknown, from whose bourne no traveler returns, with greater courage, with greater faith, and greater confidence than had CHARLEY TOBEY. I think of his going in the words of Tennyson:

Sunset and evening star and one clear call
for me,
And may there be no moaning of the bar
when I put out to sea.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, when I came to the Senate in 1947, I followed a course, which is common to all of us, of seeking someone on the floor to whom I could look for leadership, guidance, and inspiration. My eye soon fell upon the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. TOBEY. He spoke with great eloquence and conviction of the old-fashioned virtues of thrift, frugality, honor, honesty, and spiritual values. I owe him a lifelong debt for the talks he had with me and with others which will remain with us throughout the years. I used to tell him that he represented the conscience of New England, and he also represented the conscience of the United States Senate, a compliment which I think he genuinely appreciated.

I was one of the Members of the Senate who went to his funeral, and I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate just a few of the details of the simple service held in a church which was organized in 1771, making it older than any State in the Union. In the typical small New England town of

Temple, having a population, I believe, of approximately 400 souls, all of whom, it seemed to me, must have been in attendance at the funeral, reflecting their great esteem, their fine respect, their admiration for the principles he so nobly demonstrated when he was with them and when he was here as their representative. The minister, Rev. Allen Lorimer, of the First Congregational Church, Montclair, N. J., a most eloquent man, read many verses which were in line with the character of CHARLES TOBEY. He read the Twenty-third Psalm, and the verses "I go to prepare a place for you," and many other scriptural passages, reflecting so well, I thought, the feelings of the people who knew CHARLES TOBEY best.

On a green hillside in the foothills of the White Mountains, all that was mortal of CHARLES TOBEY was laid in the ground to become in time a part of the eternal green of the trees, and his soul went to the God whom he so sincerely worshiped and with whom I am sure his soul will find an eternal resting place.

Thank God for the life of CHARLES TOBEY. A sound America lives so long as the spirit of CHARLES TOBEY lives.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to CHARLES TOBEY, in expressing my sympathy to his wife, his children, and his grandchildren, and in expressing our deep sense of loss in the passing of this truly great and rugged American. I first met him many years ago when I became a Member of the House of Representatives. He was a man who was interested in his fellow men and he always had a ready hand and a cheery word to help a new Member of Congress over the difficulties which attend the early service of a new Member of Congress. I served on the committee of which he was the able chairman.

He had not only a fine sense of justice and strong feelings of indignation against corruption and crime, but he was willing to spend his energies in combating wrongdoing.

During the long months of this session Senator TOBEY commuted back and forth to conduct waterfront hearings to clear up the bad situation in the shipping industry. This tiring and exhausting task could have been delegated to younger Members, but Senator TOBEY wished to see that the work was properly done, and he did it excellently.

The Senate is an institution which has become great because of the character, the leadership, the justice, and the honor of the men who have served here. I doubt if anyone who ever walked the floor of the Senate brought more integrity and honor to this great institution than did Senator TOBEY. If the Senate has a conscience, as it assuredly has, I like to feel it is symbolized in the rugged, truly American conscience of Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY. As we went to the funeral, in his own dearly beloved New England, with its rock-clad hills and towering pines, I thought of the spring from which our liberties flow. I thought of the crystal clear water of which came the straight thinking of CHARLES W. TOBEY. That stream which carries on from its source in the early days when this Union was formed and which was re-

flected in his voice on the floor of the United States Senate had a direct, lineal connection between our forefathers, who gave birth to this great idealism of democracy, and ourselves.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to join with my colleagues in paying well-deserved tribute to our late departed friend, Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY. I am certain none of us have the appropriate words to express our heartfelt feelings in respect to this distinguished and wonderful man.

I like to think of CHARLES TOBEY in very simple terms. I like to think of him as a friend—and he was a good and sincere friend. He was a friend to those who wanted to enjoy and be inspired by his qualities of character and personality.

It does not take years to develop friendship, Mr. President; it takes only a willingness to share in such a blessed experience.

To those of us young and new in public service, Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY was a great friend, and the nature of his spirit carried that friendship from his soul, and anyone privileged to share it, found there strength and guidance.

CHARLES TOBEY liked to help other people. That is a simple quality, but it is a wonderful one. He liked to help people, because I am sure that in his life he found times when he needed help.

I once heard a man of great wisdom say that people can never know what it is to sorrow until sadness and grief have come to their families. People can never know what it is to have sympathy until they have been in need of that consoling and healing emotion from others. I feel certain that CHARLES TOBEY knew all those things, because he lived a full life.

I think it can be best said that CHARLES TOBEY was a good man. He was a decent man. It is not necessary to say he was smart or intelligent. This is readily accepted and understood. The world is filled with such people. But what the world needs is men of decency and goodness. CHARLES TOBEY was that kind of man.

He was a brave and courageous man. His enemies knew it, and the forces of evil and sin, which he fought against, realized it.

CHARLES TOBEY was a great man, great not only as a scholar, and a philosopher, but great also because he was a man in the best sense that God Almighty could create.

He was an honorable citizen and a fine public servant. CHARLES TOBEY was an inspiration to young and old alike. His life served to remind the young that political participation and public service can be and should be honorable pursuits. Thank God for that inspiration at a time when far too many people are skeptical and cynical about public life and public service.

The life of CHARLES TOBEY reveals to those who are in the twilight of life that man's spirit can ever be fresh, vigorous, and useful; that chronological age has nothing to do with the beauty, liveliness, and a youthfulness of spirit which God keeps alive.

So I say the spirit of CHARLES TOBEY lives on. His is a spirit that is to be found wherever there is a struggle for

righteousness over the forces of evil. His is the spirit of love conquering hate; of compassion for those who are in need. His is the spirit of the kindness of the good Samaritan.

CHARLES TOBEY believed in people. He was not cynical even about those who had fallen by the wayside.

How well we remember that in recent weeks he revealed to the Senate that one who had been a public law officer, and had strayed from the paths of honor and integrity, through the efforts of CHARLES TOBEY returned to the straight and narrow and was now doing his job in an honorable and courageous manner.

CHARLES TOBEY was a builder. He was a helper. To him brotherhood was not simply a word. It was a testimonial of faith in God's children, created in the image of their Maker.

That is why CHARLES TOBEY believed in human dignity and practiced it. He believed in God's finest creation—man. He believed people should be free—free to grow, free to develop, free to create.

To CHARLES TOBEY, democracy was not politics alone. It was a spiritual faith, and his political life was motivated by that faith.

Finally, I believe those of us in the Senate and throughout America, who have so much to learn as we live, can look upon the life and works of CHARLES TOBEY as representing America at its best; the kind of America we love and revere, and to which we pay tribute by our patriotism and our devotion.

His was a life of industry, of progressive thought, and of worthy deed, a life of service to mankind.

On behalf of Mrs. Humphrey and myself and our family, I extend heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Tobey and to the family of CHARLES TOBEY.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President—

We know when moons shall wane,
When summer birds from far shall cross the sea,
When autumn's hues shall tinge the golden grain—
But Death, oh, who shall teach us when to look for thee?

Leaves have their time to fall,
And flowers to wither at the northwind's breath,
And stars to set;—but all,
Thou hast all seasons for thine own,
O Death!

This loathed, melancholy monarch of all he surveys, whose right there is none to dispute, with his swift sword of extinction, his unsympathetic scepter of grief and his sorrow's crown of sorrow, has for the second time within 30 days robbed the Senate of one of its most distinguished Members. Once more the silver cord has been loosed, the golden bowl broken, the pitcher broken at the fountain, the wheel broken at the cistern. Once more the mourners go about the streets. They are weeping in Washington and New Hampshire for the beloved late Senator "CHARLEY" TOBEY as Rachel wept in Rama for her children and would not be comforted because they were not.

With bowed heads, heavy hearts, and irrepressible emotion, we pay our last tribute of respect to this noble legislator, orator, statesman, patriot and friend. He confronted life with daunt-

less courage. With Christian faith, he obeyed the Master's commandment to set out upon the solemn sea that separates the narrow shore of time from the boundless kingdom of eternity.

We affectionately extol Senator TOBEY's virtues, laud his service, and eulogize the characteristics that made him an ornament to the Senate, an asset to his country, and a blessing to humanity. His life was a soothing benediction to all who knew him. His death is an irreparable loss to the Republic which he dearly loved and faithfully served, and to which he diligently devoted the most fruitful years of his life. He was extraordinary in intellect, great in heart, and sublime in soul.

He began his brilliant political career by serving two terms in the New Hampshire House of Representatives and an additional term as speaker of that house. He next became a member and the president of the New Hampshire State Senate. Later he was elected Governor of New Hampshire in recognition of the honest, efficient public service he had rendered. Subsequently he was elected a Member of the 73d, 74th, and 75th Congresses. In 1938 he was elected a Member of the United States Senate, which is commonly known as the greatest legislative body in the world. He was reelected to the Senate in 1944 and 6 years later he was elected Senator for a third term which, if he had lived, would not have expired until January 1957.

At 40 his name was a household word in New Hampshire. At 50 the fame he had achieved and the honors he had won proclaimed him a political genius and one of fortune's favorite sons. His tireless energy was comparable to his outstanding ability and surpassing devotion to duty. During his entire service in the Senate he was the embodiment of the belief and supplication expressed in the following lines:

Better a day of strife
Than a century of sleep;
Give me instead of a long stream of life
The tempests and tears of the deep.

Only last Friday he actively discharged his duties on the floor of the Senate. It seems but an hour ago that he was thrilling the hearts of the Members of this body with his eloquent admonitions to loftier ideals, greater devotion to duty, and sublimer service to God. But now we call his name in vain. He will answer "Here" no more. He has passed the limits of earthly vision. His shadowy form cannot be seen through the telescopes of science or the tears of grief. In the hush and sadness that pervade the sanctuary of our dead we ask anew the world-old question propounded by the suffering patriarch of Uz:

If a man die, shall he live again?

But, unlike the afflicted Job, we seek no refuge either in silence or submission. We simply turn from this perplexing question of the Old Testament to find it answered in the New by Him who came 15 centuries after Job and said:

Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life.

Thanks to the hallowed hope which springs eternal in the Christian breast,

we believe that the separation from our beloved colleague and friend is but for a night and that joy cometh in the morning. On occasions such as this thoughts of the last bitter hour come like a blight over our spirits. But even now, when earthly help and sympathy seem vain, we look beyond the cloud that hangs above us like a pall and there, through faith, we see the star of hope still shining on. In the lustrous light of that constant star, we read the assuring promise of the Savior of the world:

I am the resurrection, and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.

In this promise we put our trust. While dogmas perish and creeds crumble; while agnosticism decays and atheism dies, we shall continue to lean upon the everlasting arm, believing that the twilight here is but the dawn of a grander day upon some other shore; believing that the feeble flame that flickers here for a little while will at last leap into a bright and shining light when the immortal spirit wings its flight back to Him that gave it birth. God pity the man who doubts the existence of another life in another land:

Who hopeless lays his dead away,
Nor looks to see the breaking day
Across the mournful marbles play:
Who hath not learned in the hours of faith
The truth, to flesh and sense unknown,
That life is ever Lord of death
And love can never lose its own.

Let us find comfort in the fact that when this dearly beloved friend was summoned—

To join
The innumerable caravan, which moves
To that mysterious realm, where each shall take
His chamber in the silent halls of death,
He went not, like the quarry slave at night,
Scourged to his dungeon, but sustained and soothed
By an unfaltering trust, approached his grave
Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
About him and lies down to pleasant dreams.

Dear friend, peacefully sleep and blissfully dream on and on, through sunshine and shadow, through seedtime and harvest, through winter's storm and summer's calm until the angelic harp-binger of the resurrection shall arouse thee from thy slumber and usher thee through the pearly gates of paradise into the never-ending joy and glory of thy Lord.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in the death of CHARLES TOBEY we have lost our best loved and one of our most respected Members. It is very hard for us to realize that he has left us in the flesh.

It is impossible to analyze the character of anyone, and it is especially difficult to pick out the salient characteristics of a man who was so attractive as CHARLES TOBEY and whose entire personality was so appealing.

In the days since his death I have been groping for the qualities which I thought were perhaps most basic in his life. It seems to me that they could be described in this way:

He was essentially a kind man, a man of complete integrity and honesty, a man of fearless courage, a man whose other

qualities were spiced with wit and humor.

Several of our colleagues have spoken of his kindness, and I believe all of us have experienced it at one time or another. I can remember when I first came to the Senate a little over 4 years ago, and had the natural feeling of fright and timidity, which we all experience when we come to this body. I suddenly looked around and found that Senator TOBEY had crossed the aisle and was sitting by my side. We had never met, although I had long known of him and respected him. But he gave me a few words of kindly greeting and encouragement, which to me were a source of strength. That was merely one very minor illustration of what he was constantly doing throughout his life.

Everyone he touched, he touched with kindness. It was not merely the individual kindness of one person to another; it was also social kindness. The hard-scrabble farmer, the slum family, men and women facing heavy sorrow, were those to whom his heart instinctively went out, and whose burdens he instinctively tried to lighten. He exemplified this characteristic not only in his individual contacts, but also as a legislator. He believed firmly that the Government was an agency for human welfare and he sought to make our Government an instrument to help humble people. So he was kind as a Senator as well as a man.

The second quality that naturally impressed us was his complete integrity. Politics is a pretty rough business. CHARLES TOBEY was in politics for 40 years. No one during that time, with any basis of fact, adversely reflected upon his complete integrity of action and of word. He never said things he did not mean. He never took a dirty dollar. He never compromised his principles. He never told half truths or untruths in order to gain political advantage. He was a man of complete honor, not merely in his personal life, but, which is much harder, in his political life as well.

He was most certainly a man of courage; indeed he was a man of flaming courage. If he believed a given position was right, he took it, regardless of consequences, regardless of who was in opposition. He achieved great fame by his readiness, with our colleague, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], to take on the criminal syndicate of this country. That required courage.

But he was not merely courageous toward sinful men who were in a sense outside the law. He was courageous also toward the rich and the successful and the powerful when they, too, sinned against the moral law.

He took on the politicians of his party and of my party when they were in the wrong. He risked his political career time after time. Some of us were afraid 3 years ago that the end had come for him.

It is a great tribute to the American people and to the people of New Hampshire that they recognized CHARLES TOBEY for what he was, and that no matter how powerful those were who were arrayed against him, every time CHARLES TOBEY won. When he won, it was not merely a personal victory, it was

a victory for the principles for which he stood.

A man can be honest and he can be courageous, and yet he can be unattractive. It was the great glory of CHARLES TOBEY that he was a winsome, loving man, partly because of his kindness, but also because of his keen sense of humor. We all loved to see him bob up in debate in a heated moment with a Latin quotation, which he had learned at the Roxbury Latin School a half century before, and it was always appropriate. We loved his keen sense of the ridiculous, which he would express at the most tense moments, and bring joy to all of us.

So with all these qualities fused together, and many others—and I suspect all went back fundamentally to his religious faith—he was our best loved Member, and we shall miss him.

This morning, as I was thinking what could best summarize his character, some lines from William Blake's poem "From Milton" came to mind. I believe they are familiar to most Senators, in a sense they describe the spirit of his life, particularly his life in the Senate:

Bring me my bow of burning gold!
Bring me my arrows of desire!
Bring me my spear! O clouds, unfold!
Bring me my chariot of fire!

I will not cease from mental fight,
Nor shall my sword sleep in my hand,
Till we have built Jerusalem
In England's green and pleasant land.

The valiant warrior, the loving spirit, the kind friend, is gone in the flesh, but his memory lives, and in that sense, as well as in others, CHARLES TOBEY is immortal.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, if ever a man in any of his expressions said something that might serve as his epitaph, it was CHARLES TOBEY. During the investigations of the Senate committee investigating crime and rackets an incident occurred when Senator TOBEY spoke as follows:

I want to say in my behalf that I have lived long years, and God has been good to me. I am a poor man and always will be. I still have a burden of debts from the First World War on my shoulders. But there is one thing I am. I am a free man. And I am willing that anything I ever did or said or wrote should stand in the light of day to anybody, friend or foe alike.

Mr. President, I recall at the time when that was uttered I thought it was one of the finest impromptu expressions I had ever heard a man make.

I am glad that in the review of his life the Associated Press the other day picked up the quotation, and it was carried through the length and breadth of our land.

In a day when all men talk about freedom it is well to remember that freedom is built by men who are free.

I think that simple sentence, "I am a free man," supported by his statement, "And I am willing that anything I ever did or said or wrote should stand in the light of day to anybody, friend or foe alike," should go down in the English language as one of the finest statements of personal freedom anyone has ever made. It was my privilege, as it was that of other Senators, first to meet CHARLES W. TOBEY as a Member of the House of

Representatives. Not long after I entered the House he came to the Senate. Thereafter, whenever I met him—whether in the halls or at the door of the Senate Chamber, when I came here—he always remembered our brief association in the House of Representatives, and I thought he felt that a little personal friendship had grown out of it.

His customary greeting to all his friends—and all of us will always associate it with his warm-hearted nature—was, "Hello, dear friend." To me that is an inspiration. I hope that some day I shall again hear him say, "Hello, dear friend."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, CHARLES TOBEY will be missed by all who had the privilege of serving with him in the Senate of the United States. It was not my privilege to know him as long as many other Members of the Senate had known him; but when I came to the Senate, 8 years ago, and at that time knew very few Members of the Senate personally, Senator TOBEY went out of his way to be helpful to me. He asked me to come to his office. He advised me on the problems of the Senate and on some of the personalities here, and he tried to make me feel at home in this body.

During the past year, I had the privilege of serving with him as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

I always found him to be most friendly. As the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has stated, Senator TOBEY's almost universal greeting, either in committee or on the floor of the Senate or in the hallways, was, "Good morning, dear friend," or "How are you, dear friend?"

Some of the most vivid recollections I have of CHARLES TOBEY are of his participation in the heated debates which sometimes occur in the Senate. On such occasions, he often would rise and, with his fine sense of humor, either would tell a story or would make an observation which would tend to break the tenseness and to give his colleagues a chance to relax a little. His humorous and wise remarks on such occasions served a very useful purpose.

On other occasions, when he was aroused, he reminded me of the way in which my grandmother who came from the State of Maine used to become aroused in what she referred to as her righteous New England indignation. I think CHARLES TOBEY had such righteous indignation when he felt either that a public trust was being betrayed or that a question of high public policy was at issue, or that some form of corruption or injustice needed to be corrected. On such occasions, CHARLES TOBEY—better than any other man I can think of—personified the righteous New England indignation.

He was born in Massachusetts, but at an early age moved to the State of New Hampshire. I shall not repeat what has been said today by my colleagues, in referring to his long service to his State and his Nation, including service in both Houses of the Congress.

Certainly those of us who were privileged to serve with him will never forget him. As long as we live, we shall

miss his greeting, "Good morning, dear friend."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on Saturday last I had the privilege of saying a few words in tribute to our late beloved colleague, CHARLES TOBEY. So I shall not speak at length at this time.

Indeed, nothing can be added to the beautiful and touching tributes which have been paid on the floor of the Senate to the life, character, and noble qualities of CHARLES W. TOBEY.

Many newspaper editorials in tribute to him have come to my attention. By means of their editorials, great numbers of our outstanding newspapers—regardless of their economic and political philosophies and views—have joined in paying tribute to the life and the high purpose of CHARLES TOBEY. I have never before seen such unanimity of opinion among the Nation's newspapers, as expressed in their editorials. Typical of them are one from the New York Times and one from the Knoxville News-Sentinel, of my own State. I ask unanimous consent that those two editorials and an article from the New York Times may be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of July 26, 1953]

A TRUE NEW ENGLANDER

CHARLES WILLIAM TOBEY, of New Hampshire, had been in public life for 40 years, beginning as a selectman and winding up as a United States Senator. A large section of the American public first became aware of him, however, when he appeared on television as a member of the Kefauver committee in 1951. Senator TOBEY's firmly compressed lips, the penetrating glance of the often stern eyes behind the glasses, the flashes of wit, the insistence on knowing where the facts about crime and criminals lay—all these made him a distinct and recognizable character.

Entering politics in his early thirties after a successful career in business, he never was the backslapping type of politician, nor did he willingly have to do with the gentlemen who make deals in the traditional smoke-filled rooms. When he thought the time had come to change his mind, he changed it. A Bull Moose in his early career, he was outraged by some New Deal policies—especially, in his role of shrewd New Englander, by the tendency to spend large sums of money. Beginning as an isolationist who as late as November 1941 voted against repeal of the Neutrality Act, he accepted the challenge of Pearl Harbor and served well and faithfully as a supporter of the internationalist policies that the war and the war's aftermath made necessary.

Nobody, not even the titular leaders of his own party, could know in advance just how his mind would work. The truth was, he worked it himself instead of letting other people make the decisions for him. He won his last senatorial election in 1950 in a knock-down-and-drag-out struggle brought on by the effort of the regular New Hampshire Republicans to put him out of business. His constituents may sometimes have been puzzled by his independence, but they respected it and they respected him.

At the age of 73, which he reached last Wednesday, he still had much to give to the people of New Hampshire and to people everywhere who respect honesty and character even in a man with whom they do not always agree. His roots were deep in New England soil and in New England traditions. It may be that he will be mostly missed for his courage—a quality in him which his country

and his party could profitably have used a little longer.

[From the New York Times of July 26, 1953]
CAPITAL MOURNS PASSING OF TOBEY—EISENHOWER SENDS A MESSAGE OF CONDOLENCE TO WIDOW—SENATE CUTS ITS SESSION

WASHINGTON, July 25.—Flags at the Capitol flew at half staff and the Senate cut short a Saturday session today and adjourned until Monday at noon, out of respect to Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, the colorful New Hampshire Republican who died last night of coronary thrombosis.

Among the many messages of condolences to the family was one from President Eisenhower, who expressed "heartfelt sympathy" in a telegram from Quantico, Va.

President Eisenhower wired his condolences to Mrs. Tobey at her Alexandria, Va., home. The message said:

"I was shocked and grieved at the sudden passing of your husband. My knowledge of Senator TOBEY's tireless efforts in the public service prompts me to pay tribute to the contributions which he made throughout a long and useful career.

"He gave himself with devotion and selflessness. Mrs. Eisenhower joins me in heartfelt sympathy."

Funeral services for Senator TOBEY, who was 73 years of age, will be held at 3 p. m., Tuesday, at the Congregational Church, in Temple, N. H., his hometown, with burial in the church cemetery.

BRIDGES PAY TRIBUTE

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire, and President pro tempore of the Senate, paid tribute to his colleague in moving adjournment of the Senate out of respect. Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California, the acting majority leader, set aside Thursday afternoon for a full session of eulogies.

Senator BRIDGES praised Senator TOBEY for his long and continuous public service as a State legislator, Governor of New Hampshire, a Member of Congress and United States Senator.

"He was a colorful figure, a crusader for what he believed and a hard fighter," Mr. BRIDGES added. "He was a very human person, whom his colleagues grew to know and to understand as the result of their close associations with him.

"New Hampshire has suffered the loss of an outstanding public servant, and the Senate has suffered the loss of one of its most distinguished and outstanding Members. I extend to Mrs. Tobey and members of his family my deepest sympathy in their great loss."

LINEUP IS 47 FOR EACH

Mr. TOBEY's death left the political division in the Senate temporarily at 47 Republicans, 47 Democrats, and 1 Independent, WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon.

Gov. Hugh Gregg, of New Hampshire, a Republican, is expected to appoint a Republican successor shortly, restoring the 48-47-1 lineup but making his choice from the conservative wing of the party. Senator TOBEY counted himself as one of what he and like-minded colleagues called the little band of liberals in the Senate. He frequently voted with the Democrats.

At the same time there was some speculation over the possible appointment of Sherman Adams, President Eisenhower's chief White House assistant. Mr. Adams is a former Governor of New Hampshire. Wesley Powell, narrowly defeated by Senator TOBEY in the 1950 primary for the Republican senatorial nomination, was also mentioned here as a possible choice.

Senator BRIDGES, who doubtless will play an influential role in the choice of a successor, declined to discuss that question.

It is known, however, that he has been worried over the possibility that Mr. Adams would run against him next year for the Republican senatorial nomination. Appoint-

ment of Mr. Adams to Senator TOBEY's seat might solve that problem, although any successor would have to stand for election next year to serve the balance of Senator TOBEY's unexpired term, which runs through 1956.

Governor Gregg, a close political friend of Senator BRIDGES, was campaign manager for Mr. Powell in the latter's unsuccessful bid for Senator TOBEY's seat in 1950. Mr. Powell, now practicing law in New Hampshire, was Senator BRIDGES' administrative assistant at the time.

WAS A COLORFUL FIGURE

Senator TOBEY's independence and sharp tongue made him one of the more colorful figures in American public life. During his career in Congress both as a Representative and Senator he was a champion of the underdog—sometimes a very emotional one.

He shared the attention of a vast television audience during the New York hearings of the Senate Crime Committee in 1951. Revelations linking criminals and high public officials so distressed him that tears flowed down his cheeks as he pleaded to heaven for reform and honesty in public life.

Several of the characters called before the committee as witnesses were themselves in tears during Senator TOBEY's emotional outbursts. His colleagues felt that he contributed a welcome touch of moral indignation to a spectacle that threatened to become a cynical recitation of a sordid phase of American life.

Because of his independence Senator TOBEY was not always in the inner councils of the Republican Party in spite of his many decades of service. During the Senate committee hearings on the removal from command of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur the Senator scored his fellow-Republicans for making too obvious efforts to take political advantage of the situation and reminded them that these efforts were resulting in an undue prolonging of the hearings. In this, as in many other debates, Senator TOBEY found appropriate Biblical quotations to support his position.

CHARLES WILLIAM TOBEY was born in Roxbury, Mass., on July 22, 1880, a son of William H. and Ellen Hall Parker Tobey. He received his entire formal education at Roxbury Latin School. An honorary M. A. degree was conferred upon him in 1939 by Dartmouth College. One of his earliest jobs was that of clerk for a Boston shoe firm.

He moved to New Hampshire in 1903 and settled in the small village of Temple, where he farmed and raised flowers. He was glad to concur in the popular statement concerning the village that it was "an Eden without original sin" and the "place where souls on their way to Paradise linger for 20 years."

Young Mr. TOBEY was chosen as a village selectman, was sent to the State legislature and finally was named to the State senate. He was elected Governor of New Hampshire in 1929 and then served in the 73d and 74th Congresses from 1933 to 1939. He was elected to the United States Senate in 1939.

DEFEATED WESLEY POWELL

During the first part of his term he was a rabid anti-New Dealer, but later proved his independence by supporting appointments such as that of Henry Wallace to the post of Secretary of Commerce. Before Pearl Harbor he was considered a strong isolationist, but he showed his interest in international cooperation by his enthusiastic work at the Bretton Woods Monetary Conference in 1944.

In 1944 Senator TOBEY was elected to a second term that ended in January 1951. Earlier his election had been more or less a routine matter, but in 1951, when he sought to return to the Senate, he had on his hands the toughest primary election fight that he had ever experienced. His opponent was Wesley Powell, a protégé of Senator STYLES BRIDGES and in the primary Senator TOBEY managed to win by about 39,000 votes to 27,000.

The duel between Senator TOBEY and William O'Dwyer, former mayor of New York, when the latter appeared before the Senate Crime Committee in New York in April 1951, was relished by one of the largest television audiences that ever had tuned in on such an event. Stung by serious accusations of having had underworld associations, Mr. O'Dwyer suddenly counterattacked by charging that Senator TOBEY himself had received campaign contributions from unknown sources. Mr. O'Dwyer said that he had the proof right in his pocket.

In a great emotional burst Senator TOBEY denied the charges which were, in fact, never seriously established. On this occasion the Senator found himself in the midst of a violent newspaper battle in his own State, with charges of official protection of illegal horse-race betting being exchanged. In addition, it was charged in the Monitor-Patriot, of Concord, N. H., that Senator TOBEY's expenditures in his Senate campaign had exceeded the legal limit fixed for this type of expenditure. The charges were never officially pressed.

With tears in his eyes, Senator TOBEY arose at one of the New York sessions of the Senate Crime Committee and declared:

"I am willing that everything I ever did or said or wrote should stand in the light of day to everybody, friend and foe alike."

RELAXED BY SINGING HYMNS

Senator TOBEY liked to think of himself as a Yankee farmer, although he was an insurance salesman and businessman as well. He was a Baptist "with a strong affection for the Episcopal service," as he once said, and one of his favorite forms of relaxation was hymn singing. He and his family would haul a light organ to a hilltop near their home and summon the neighbors for a good old-fashioned hymn festival.

Senator TOBEY's mother had required him to read a little of the Bible every day, and he never deviated from this habit. A favorite bit of advice—one he frequently gave to students in his old school—ran something as follows:

"Make it a point every day to talk to somebody who knows more than you do."

[From the Knoxville News-Sentinel of July 27, 1953]

GOD'S ANGRY MAN

Few men who have been in the United States Senate have had more personal color and more tireless drive than Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, of New Hampshire, who died Saturday.

Senator TOBEY was a man whose beliefs and disbeliefs were dramatically on view for all to see. Because of his emotional reaction to the sordid and revolting recital of crime and corruption, as revealed in 1951 by the Kefauver committee, Senator TOBEY became nationally known as "God's angry man."

But the Senator, in his 20 years in Congress, also earned a reputation for a singularly stubborn brand of political independence. He long considered himself a member of the little band of liberals on the Republican side of the Senate—back in New Deal days—and frequently, by his votes and speeches, justified this classification.

Much already has been said about the Senator's energetic crusading, his faithfulness to his position, and the services he performed.

But, whatever else history may say of him, it cannot fail to put down Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY as a man capable of great moral indignation at a time when that essential ingredient of public service was all too lacking.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, as has been stated, one test of a man is to be found in his relationships with his family and with those who work with him. The devotion of Senator TOBEY's

family to him was outstanding, as was the devotion to him of the members of his office staff and the members of the staffs of the various committees on which he served, and of some of which he was chairman. The companionship he enjoyed with the members of the staff of his office and the members of the staffs of his committees will long be remembered.

Mr. President, we have indeed lost a great Senator and a wonderful friend.

I wish to express my personal sympathy to Senator TOBEY's wife and the other members of his family, and to the members of his office staff and the staffs of the committees on which he served.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, in the 14 years that I have served in the House and the Senate, I have heard many inspiring eulogies delivered by the Members of Congress in praising their colleagues who have passed on. I myself have delivered eulogies on this floor and on the floor of the House.

But this time, Mr. President, there is so much to say, and I feel so deeply, that I do not know where to start and where to end. No death in the Senate has been such a blow to me as the death of the beloved Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY. Mere words simply cannot express the choking grief I feel. No one can take the place of CHARLES TOBEY in the Senate and in the hearts of Americans throughout the Nation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, last Saturday morning, when we learned that CHARLES TOBEY was dead, it did not seem real. It did not seem possible that one who had been so close to us and who was so badly needed by his country at times such as the present could have been taken suddenly from our midst; but it was real. The sympathy of all of us, and all the sympathy we can muster, goes to his widow, his children, and the other members of his family; to the members of the office force who served him so loyally, and to the community which claimed him.

It is futile for me to attempt to put into words what I feel about CHARLES TOBEY. We were near neighbors in the hills of New England. For many years I had been privileged to call him friend. It has been said on the floor of the Senate this afternoon that he was a great man. Few will dispute that statement. But, Mr. President, what is a great man? It depends upon one's definition of "greatness." If the acquisition of wealth and being lionized and adored among the ranks of social and economic royalty are necessary ingredients of greatness, then it may be that CHARLES TOBEY was not great. But if a determination to do right; to relieve suffering wherever it might be found; to destroy evil; to love one's home, family, and friends; to endure sorrow, sickness, and death among his loved ones, while still retaining faith in his fellow man and being governed by an unswerving determination to serve his country and his God—if such a determination constitutes greatness, then CHARLES TOBEY was among the noblest and greatest of them all.

I know something of the emotional strain under which he labored, the con-

stant threats on the part of the forces of evil to destroy him, the continuous sickness and suffering from which, it seems, his immediate family was never free; his utter love for his home and his community, and the homesickness of being away from them. This fall, he would have picked the first crop of peaches from a new orchard which he himself planted 3 years ago. He had looked forward to it; and he was always thinking of his New Hampshire home. He had planned to set out new lilac bushes this fall around the old-fashioned farm home in which he live so long.

Some of us may recall that about the first week in October of each year "CHARLIE" TOBEY would miss a few sessions of the Senate. It was the time when the coloring leaves of autumn always called him back to New Hampshire. To visit his native heath at that time was almost a ritual with him.

America needs men in high places who are not too important to love the homespun things of life. On last Tuesday I was among the hundreds who attended the funeral of "CHARLIE" TOBEY. The white church on the New Hampshire hilltop seats but 200 people. Very many of his other old friend, neighbors, and admirers, from near and far, stood sadly outside the church in the clear air and sunshine, in an atmosphere that only a summer day in New England can produce. The service was short and simple, as he would have desired it to be.

Following the services, he was laid at rest in the little pine-shaded cemetery, among the surroundings which gave him the inspiration to do good, to crusade evil, to love his fellow man, and to have faith in his God.

Mr. President, one of the Nation's truly great men, and one of its humblest, now sleeps among the peaceful hills which gave him moral and spiritual strength. I know that his fondest hope would be that others will continue the work which he so nobly carried on.

The services at the funeral of Senator TOBEY were conducted by one of his old New Hampshire friends and neighbors, Rev. Allan I. Lorimer, D. D., of Montclair, N. J. I ask unanimous consent to have a transcript of the services printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERVICES FOR SENATOR CHARLES TOBEY IN
TEMPLE, N. H., JULY 28, 1953

(Rev. Allan I. Lorimer, D. D., pastor of the First Congregational Church of Montclair, N. J.)

"Now the laborer's task is o'er,
Now the battle day is past.
Now upon that farther shore
Lands the voyager at last.
Father, in Thy gracious keeping,
Here we leave Thy servant, sleeping."

"I am the resurrection and the life, saith the Lord: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live, and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die."

"Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

"God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in time of trouble."

For generations the 23d Psalm has comforted the sorrowing heart and sustained the soul of the lonely with peace of mind and faith.

"The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures: he leadeth me beside the still waters."

"He restoreth my soul."

"He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake."

"Yea; though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for Thou art with me."

"Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies: Thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over. Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life: and I will dwell in the House of the Lord forever."

"Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted. Peace I leave with you; my peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither be afraid. Ye believe in God, believe also in Me. In My Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you, that where I am, there ye may be also."

"And I heard a voice from Heaven, saying, 'Blessed are the dead who have died in the Lord from henceforth.' Yea, saith the spirit, that they may rest from their labors, and their works do follow them."

"Therefore are they before the throne of God, and serve Him day and night in His temple; and he that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them."

"They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more; neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat."

"For the lamb, which is in the midst of the throne, shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters; and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes."

"No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will hold to the one and despise the other. Ye cannot serve both God and Mammon."

"Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful. But his delight is in the law of the Lord, and in His law doth he meditate day and night."

PRAYER: SENATOR CHARLES TOBEY

Almighty and Eternal God, from whom each of us hath come, for whom each of us should live, and to whom, at our appointed hour, each of us must return, bestow Thy presence upon us, we beseech Thee, as gathered together in this solemn hour we give thanks unto Thee for the life of this, thy son, Charles, whom Thou has given us, who lived and loved among us, who served faithfully his beloved State, his Nation, and his God.

We come to Thee, not because we are strong but because we need Thee. Thou dost create our bodies from the dust. Our souls and spirits come from Thee, and return to Thee when our earthly life is over. So runs our faith. For that faith we bless Thee.

Speak to each of us in this solemn hour Thy word of hope and peace. Strengthen us in our deepest hope, that ties and affections binding us so intimately together upon earth cannot be lost or broken, that whosoever liveth and believeth in Thee shall not die but have everlasting life.

Wilt Thou hear our silent prayers of gratitude, affection, and respect for the life of this, Thy son, Charles; the silent prayers of his neighbors and fellow townsmen who gave to, and received from him, friendship, and faith; the prayers of the plain people of New Hampshire whose trust in him ever found response, and the yearning to represent their finer and more considered interests in both State and Nation; the prayers of those who served with him in the highest councils of our land and who found in him a constant champion of Christian honor and a compelling voice of Christian conscience. And

wilt Thou hear the prayers of his host of friends, in high places and in low, in towns and villages and cities across the length and breadth of our great land who rightfully placed their faith in him as Thine ambassador to remove the powers of Satan and his dark shadows from our beloved America.

Especially do we pray for Thy comfort and benediction upon his family, upon his children and his grandchildren, his wife, all who were near and dear to him. May they be comforted by his deep and genuine faith that love and affection bound to the years of family living, in the wondrous mystery of death, bring us all nearer to Thee and to Thy Fatherly care; do Thou enable the Nation to live as our Senator would have us live, that life of righteousness, honor, and peace, until that day of great reunion, when neither death nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus, our Lord.

APPRECIATION: SENATOR CHARLES TOBEY

CHARLES TOBEY was equally at home whether in leading a crusade for Jesus Christ or in conducting a crusade against crime. He was the unique apostle of Christ who could lead a hymn sing in his beloved town of Temple, deeply move a congregation to a compelling devotion to the highest and finest values of the Christian faith, and in the Nation lash forth at a criminal who had violated the moral law. We all remember his moral indignation at a man who sought to undermine America in institutions:

"Come clean, man, and bare your soul before almighty God."

CHARLES TOBEY dramatically expressed the American conscience toward wickedness and corruption in our homeland. I like to think of his leadership in terms of the saying, "Full steam ahead in the name of the Lord, and damn the torpedoes." His was the indignation of the Boston Tea Party brought to bear against the evils of our day. CHARLES TOBEY was that rare person, a genuine Christian influencing the departments of Government. His moral indignation against pharisaism was equaled by his deep-seated desire to place truth and justice and righteousness upon the throne. We think of Senator TOBEY in terms of another great American who said, "It is the business of little minds to shrink; but he whose heart is firm, and whose conscience approves his conduct, will pursue his principles unto death."

I remember well once hearing the Senator deliver an accounting of his office before a group of New Hampshire citizens. He told us that for years he had taken to his heart a famous saying of Abraham Lincoln, and had tried to make this saying the basis of his service to the Nation: "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

CHARLES TOBEY was unawed by opinion which he believed to be wrong. He was undismayed by opposition that suggested ulterior motives. He was unyielding in his devotion to Christian conscience, and totally undisturbed by personal threat. CHARLES TOBEY confronted life with courage. Our State is better, and our Nation is finer for his having dwelled among us. Not much better could be said of any man. He courageously represented the finest instincts of Christian America. God bless New Hampshire for having given the Nation such a loyal servant of Jesus Christ.

"Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide

In the strife of truth with falsehood, for the good or evil side:

Some great cause, God's new Messiah, offering each the bloom or blight,

And the choice goes by forever, 'twixt that darkness and that light.

Though the cause of evil prosper, yet 'tis truth alone is strong,

Though her portion be the scaffold, and upon the throne be wrong—

Yet that scaffold sways the future, and behind the dim unknown

Standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch above His own."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in the passing of CHARLES TOBEY the Senate has lost one of its best known and most memorable figures. CHARLES TOBEY was a man of honest convictions. He was a man of humor, one who thoroughly enjoyed life and who looked upon the passing scene without fear. CHARLES TOBEY was a righteous man, a man whose conscience was clear. CHARLES TOBEY was a good man, a man who walked in the narrow path of rectitude.

We who have served with him for so many years, both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, feel a very keen sense of loss. We shall miss his flashing wit, his courageous championship of that which he believed to be right, his bitter condemnation of evil in whatever form it appeared.

CHARLES TOBEY was a progressive, a colorful, a courageous, and conscientious Senator. Our hearts go out to his family in their bereavement.

We shall miss him greatly.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 52. An act for the relief of Anny Del Curto;

S. 61. An act for the relief of Hedwig Marek and Emma Elizabeth Marek;

S. 228. An act for the relief of Irene Ezitis;

S. 312. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Orsi;

S. 561. An act for the relief of Charles Chardon Brooks;

S. 672. An act for the relief of Agostino Giusto;

S. 1366. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose Montero;

S. 1442. An act to amend section 202 of the Federal Power Act, with respect to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over persons and facilities engaged in the transmission or sale of electric energy to foreign countries;

S. 1516. An act for the relief of Akemi Terada;

S. 1704. An act for the relief of Christina Pantellis Triantafyllu; and

S. 2104. An act to authorize the payment of compensation to Clarence A. Beutel, formerly Deputy Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the period from September 10, 1952, through June 1, 1953.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1456) for the relief of Susan Kay Burkhalter, a minor.

The message further announced that the House had further disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5728) to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SHORT, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SHAFER, Mr. VINSON, Mr. BROOKS of

Louisiana, and Mr. DURHAM were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1397) to clarify the status of mining claims on land known to be valuable for oil or gas or included in oil and gas leases, or applications or offers for such leases, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2220) to amend the mineral leasing laws with respect to their application in the case of pipelines passing through the public domain.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1753) for the relief of Marigo Th. Tspoura, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. Without objection, the Senate will resume the consideration of legislative business.

HEARINGS OF SENATE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE ON GOLD REDEMPTION BILL

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have just made with respect to holding hearings shortly after the first of next year on a bill introduced by the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A number of questions have been asked me as to what action the Senate Banking and Currency Committee plans with regard to the gold-redemption bill, introduced by Senator STYLES BRIDGES and referred to this committee. This subject, in my opinion, is one of major national importance which should be fully explored by hearings that will bring out the facts.

Senator BRIDGES' bill was introduced in the House by Representative CARROLL REECE, Republican, of Tennessee, and three different bills of a similar nature have also been introduced in the House of Representatives. This indicates the public interest in the subject. Also, the Republican Party pledged in its 1952 platform to bring about a "Dollar fully convertible into gold."

I have referred the Bridges bill to the Subcommittee on Federal Reserve Matters headed by Senator JOHN BRICKER, of Ohio. Other members of the subcommittee are Senators BENNETT, of Utah; PAYNE, of Maine; GOLDWATER, of Arizona; MAYBANK, of South

Carolina; Robertson, of Virginia; and Douglas, of Illinois.

I anticipate that the subcommittee will hold hearings either late this year or early in 1954, soon after the opening of the 2d session of the 83d Congress.

CEREMONY AT THE NATIONAL AIRPORT HONORING "ADAPTABLE ANNIE," AN AIRPLANE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the remarks I made a couple of weeks ago at the National Airport in respect to an airplane known as "Adaptable Annie," a Hoosier-adopted airplane, which will spend the rest of its days in the Smithsonian Institution.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

About 2 weeks ago, it was my pleasure to participate in a colorful and significant ceremony, marking the retirement of a lady named "Adaptable Annie." The venerable Annie was being honored for 20 years of faithful service to civil aviation, the last 12 of them in Indianapolis, at the Civil Aeronautics Administration's Technical Development and Evaluation Center.

This Hoosier by adoption was born in Seattle at the Boeing airplane factory, and originally was known only by a number—247-B. It was because of her versatile performance in development work at Indianapolis, after an earlier career in racing, airline operation, and corporation flying, that she acquired the name "Adaptable Annie."

After more than 8,000 hours of flying, which means almost 1,500,000 miles, Annie has earned a rest. In the ceremony I attended, the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics presented Annie to the National Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institution. Now that Annie joins the ranks of famous old airplanes in this repository, it is appropriate that we look back at some of the contributions she has made to civil aviation advancement.

She began her CAA service in projects which resulted in development of the first successful very high frequency communications from ground to air, now vital to traffic control. Soon after, she was put to work in the elimination of precipitation static, and it has been said that she looked like a tramp's clothesline, with tattered streamers trailing from all points.

In 1941, Annie served as the flying guinea pig for the microwave instrument landing system, in which the Klystron tube, destined to play a part in World War II radar, made its debut outside the laboratory.

When testing began in 1942 on the very high frequency, combination visual-audio radio ranges, predecessor of the so-called omniranges which CAA operates all over the Nation today, Annie put in many hours of flight checking.

Annie also got in the act when CAA developed and evaluated devices to warn pilots against stalls, the chief hazard in private flying. Annie's wings were daubed with sawdust and glue to simulate ice, in order to find out what the effect of ice would be on the various types of stall warners.

During the war years, Annie was drafted for many operations conducted jointly by CAA with the Wright Field research laboratories, including studies of automatic flight control, high-frequency direction finders, and other important war projects.

Following the war, Annie resumed work on a variety of peacetime projects, such as distance-measuring equipment, improved aircraft lighting, and the omnirange.

With the increasing speed of aircraft, the need arose for lights that would make aircraft visible to pilots at greater distances. A high intensity light, swinging from side to side over a wide angle, was conceived. To make the test installation required considerable cutting and change of an airplane wing, and, of course, Annie was nominated for the job.

But colorful and important as Annie has been in the work of the Technical Development Center, her activities represent only a fraction of what goes on at the Indianapolis CAA facility. We of Indiana are very proud of what has been accomplished by these hard-working engineers, and I would like to tell you a little more about what they are doing for our civil-aviation progress.

Fire prevention, and the related problems of detecting and extinguishing aircraft fires when they do occur, are significant parts of the TD operation. The wide range of testing being done in this field is illustrated by the fact that last year engines for the Convair 340, one of the latest civil airliners, and for the military B-36, both were being subjected to exhaustive investigation of behavior under fire.

When the Indianapolis CAA scientists go at a question like this, they really do it thoroughly. They put the engine in a wind tunnel, turn a terrific blast of air on it to simulate flight speeds of as much as 650 miles an hour, start a fire in it, then extinguish the fire with various combinations of chemicals. More than 5,000 separate fires were started and then put out on a naval transport installation.

This kind of fire-testing has produced many constructive results, including the identification of non-ignitable hydraulic fluids, now in use by the Navy; effective new fire-extinguishing agents such as bromotrifluoromethane; and fire-retardant coatings for the fabric of light aircraft.

The Center is doing extensive development work on crash-resistant fuel tanks, and in collaboration with rubber manufacturers, 95 new materials developed for use in casings and liners of tanks were evaluated. "Evaluated" is an academic-sounding word, but in this case it means something quite dynamic. CAA puts the tank on a carriage, launches it down a track with a catapult, and slams it into a barricade at the end of the track.

The variety of activities under way at Indianapolis is little short of astonishing. Here you have high intensity lights getting a try-out on the rotor wing tips of a helicopter. There you have what is known as the dynamic air traffic control simulator, a device which enables CAA experts to duplicate the traffic control problems of such busy areas as Washington, New York and Chicago, and painlessly work out improved control procedures.

While one group is making cockpit visibility studies with a specially devised camera dubbed "Rodney the Robot," another weighs the merits of different models of pictorial computers. These computers, which will help make air navigation of the future almost automatic, liberally picture position for the pilot by means of a silhouette of the airplane moving over a chart of the area being flown.

Many end-products of Indianapolis development find application in the larger picture of CAA operations. As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I have had occasion to follow these operations closely. Few people realize the scope of this Commerce Department agency's work, and I believe it would be interesting and valuable to review for a moment what CAA as a whole is doing.

Consider the various communications, traffic control, and navigation devices we have mentioned as developed at Indianapolis—they tie in to the 110,000 mile network

of Federal airways which makes possible the safe and regular flight of civil and military aircraft in almost any weather.

What makes up this network? People and facilities, probably located in your home town. If a pilot is going to take off on a cross-country flight along the airways, he will get his flight plan cleared by one of the 32 air route traffic control centers which assign airplanes courses at safely separated altitudes. Should he be departing from one of the more than 150 busy airports where CAA control towers are located, it will clear him for takeoff as rapidly as local arriving and departing traffic permits. As he speeds along his way, he will keep in touch with some of the more than 400 CAA communications stations, receiving weather information and giving position reports which are forwarded to air route traffic control. Although he may be flying on top of cloud layers which block out all ground landmarks, the signals of the CAA radio ranges will mark out highways in the sky straight to his destination. Coming in to land, if there is low ceiling and visibility, he may be guided through the overcast into sight of the runway by an instrument landing system or precision approach radar operated by CAA.

Establishment, operation, and maintenance of these essential airways facilities all over the country account for most of the CAA personnel. Much smaller in numbers, but no less important to all who fly (and that now means 30 million Americans a year), is the group of CAA experts who administer the safety regulations.

The safety effort begins when a plane is on the drawing board. CAA engineers work closely with the manufacturer in assuring compliance of his design with the Civil Air Regulations. When the plane enters the production stage, the inspection process is continued, by CAA agents or industry representatives whom they designate.

Safety vigilance carries on throughout the service life of the airplane. Regular airworthiness checks are required, and here again CAA works with industry and holds down its costs by authorizing more than 1,500 designees to perform these inspections.

Given a safe airplane, we must also have safe pilots. The CAA helps in this direction not only by discharging its statutory responsibility of issuing certificates of competency to pilots and other air personnel, but by a continuing program of education, through publications, posters, discussion meetings, and other methods.

When planes and pilots are put together in a big operation like an airline, CAA must approve the carrier's safety procedures. Before service is opened on a new route, CAA agents ride along on a proving run, observing the radio aids, maintenance facilities and other aspects significant to safety. At all times, they work with the carriers to maintain a high standard in safety practices.

This joint effort has brought about a dramatic improvement in the safety record. When the Civil Aeronautics Act was passed in 1938, the number of fatalities for domestic and international air carriers was 5.2 per 100 million passenger-miles. Last year, the figure was 0.9.

Another phase of CAA activity is its participation in the improvement of our national airport system. It advises municipalities and other airport sponsors on the best planning and construction practices, and under the Federal Airport Act has assisted financially in the construction and improvement of almost 1,200 airports.

The sum total of CAA operations, in the airways, safety, airports and other fields, is an impressive contribution toward the objective expressed by Congress in the Civil Aeronautics Act—the encouragement and development of civil aeronautics.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND IN BASALT, COLO.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there are two bills which I should like to have the Senate consider at this time. The first is House bill 3107. I ask the Chair to lay it before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 3107) to provide for the conveyance of certain national-forest land in Basalt, Colo., which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSFER OF LAND AT CHERRY POINT, N. C.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the second bill I desire to have considered at this time is House bill 2458.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 2458) to authorize the transfer of certain lands located at Cherry Point, N. C., and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JURISDICTION OVER SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF — CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference of the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the chairman of the Senate conferees on the so-called Outer Continental Shelf bill, House bill 5134, I am presenting to the Senate at this time the report of the conference committee, Report No. 1031. The House accepted this report last night.

Before I discuss the several minor amendments to which the conference agreed, I wish to advert for a moment to the major issue involved in the action of the conferees.

Members of the Senate will recall that after considerable debate and consideration of substitute proposals, the Senate, by a record vote, adopted what is generally known as the Hill educational amendment to the Outer Continental Shelf measure. The bill which I had the honor of reporting to the Senate, S. 1901, was amended by the adoption of Senator Hill's proposal, and the entire measure then passed by the Senate. The Senate then substituted its bill, with the Hill amendment, for the House bill, H. R. 5134, by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the Senate's provisions.

In the conference, the Senate conferees tried, with all the powers of persuasion at their command, to persuade the House conferees to accept the Senate amendment, and thereafter to secure some compromise in the field covered by the amendment.

HOUSE CONFEREES REFUSE TO COMPROMISE

The House conferees refused to recede from their objections to the amendment and refused to entertain any compromise in the nature of some provision which would sequester all receipts from the outer Continental Shelf for some period. The period suggested, first, was 5 years, and thereafter was 3 years. During this period the funds would have been held in suspense pending some affirmative action of the Congress.

The conferees on the Senate side stood firmly on the Senate bill in this respect as long as there was any hope of any agreement in the conference. The acting chairman of the Senate conferees then sought to find a parliamentary procedure by which the Senate might adopt the several perfecting amendments to the Senate form of H. R. 5134 with respect to which the conferees had agreed. In this way the question might have been narrowed to the single one of the Hill amendment.

An examination of the rules indicated that such a procedure was not possible. The reason was that there was but one amendment before the conference as a result of the fact that the Senate had passed its bill and then substituted the language of its bill for the House bill. The result was that the conference found itself with one amendment before it, and that was the entire bill.

REPORT ON WHOLE BILL ONLY

Under those circumstances, any report which could be presented to the Senate must be a report on the whole bill. Ordinarily, Senators will recall, when a bill is amended there may be numerous amendments, but they are single, separate actions, and a conference may take them up in order and, in its report, identify each amendment and the action taken thereon.

In this case, because of the fact that there was but one amendment before the conference, there could be but one amendment acted upon and reported to the respective Houses.

Under such circumstances, Mr. President, the majority of the conferees for the Senate became convinced that the only action that could be taken validly under the parliamentary rules under which we function, was that of acting upon a conference report on a whole measure on which there was agreement.

As a last resort the conference group representing the Senate made such an agreement. This meant that the conferees of the Senate were forced to agree to the demands of the House for the elimination from the outer Continental Shelf bill of two sections thereof known as the Hill educational amendment. This action thus brings the report before the Senate. It has already been before the House. It was presented yesterday and was immediately agreed to.

Before discussing the major question, which is the Hill amendment, I invite

attention to the several minor amendments which were made in the bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Would the Senator inform the Senate whether the conference considered, in its deliberations on the Hill amendment, the Hendrickson amendment?

Mr. CORDON. The answer is in the affirmative, Mr. President. The Senate conferees first presented, as it was obviously their duty to do, the action of the Senate in adopting the Hill amendment, and urged that the House agree thereto. When there was complete and absolutely adamant refusal to accept the aid-to-education proposal, the Senate conferees called attention to the substitute for the Hill provision offered by the junior Senator from New Jersey. The Senate conferees vigorously urged that the House conferees agree upon it as a compromise.

HENDRICKSON PROPOSAL REJECTED

The House conferees refused to compromise and rejected the Hendrickson proposal. It was only thereafter that the Senate conferees tried to get the revenues requested, to prevent holding up further action by Congress in the affirmative field, and that also was refused.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CORDON. I call attention to areas in the bill wherein there was agreement between the conferees of both Houses and where I believe there will be little or no objection on the part of the Senate. I call attention to them because reference to either the report as it appears on page 10630 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, July 29, or to any other source, fails to identify the several minor changes in the bill as it passed the Senate. One could identify those amendments only by a careful comparison between the bill as it passed the Senate and the bill as it was reported from the conference.

The first of the changes appears on page 22 of H. R. 5134 as it passed the Senate.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Do I understand correctly that the conference report, down to the first change, which the Senator is about to outline, is the bill exactly as it was passed by the Senate?

Mr. CORDON. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. Are we to understand further that the Senator will explain the changes that have been made in the Senate bill?

Mr. CORDON. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CORDON. The first amendment made in the bill as it passed the Senate is on page 22, where there was added on line 10, after the period, a sentence reading as follows:

State taxation laws shall not apply to the outer Continental Shelf.

In my opinion, that language is unnecessary. It adds nothing to and took

nothing from the bill as it passed the Senate. It was requested in a superabundance of caution, and was agreed to by the Senate conferees when offered by the House conferees.

CHANGE RECOMMENDED BY JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

The next amendment is on the same page, page 22, the language beginning in line 17, and ending in line 20 with the word "Appeals," was stricken from the bill upon the recommendation of the Department of Justice. The Department felt that the general rule of law, that the expression of one thing is the exclusion of others in the same class, might apply, and the conferees deleted the language indicated.

The third amendment appears on page 24, line 4. After the word "district," there are inserted the words "of the adjacent State." This is a perfecting amendment only.

The next amendment is wholly perfecting language, and is found on page 24, line 12, where the word "it," the third word from the end of the line, is stricken, and the word "he" is inserted in lieu thereof.

The next amendment is on page 25, line 4, and is in itself also perfecting language. The language "the subsoil and seabed of the outer Continental Shelf and the" is to be inserted in line 4, after the word "to."

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. It is difficult to follow these changes unless a phrase or the entire sentence is read as it now appears in the conference report. Would the Senator from Oregon state exactly how the phrase now reads as recommended by the conference?

Mr. CORDON. Yes. The language now reads, beginning with the paragraph in line 3:

The specific application by this section of certain provisions of law to the subsoil and seabed of the outer Continental Shelf and the artificial islands and fixed structures referred to in subsection (a) —

And so forth.

CHANGE IN PROVISIONS FOR USE OF STATE CONSERVATION AGENCIES

The sixth amendment is found on page 25, line 25. In order that that amendment may be better understood, I shall first read the sentence in which it occurs. Beginning in line 23, the sentence is:

In the enforcement of conservation laws, rules, and regulations the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the conservation agencies of the adjacent States, and if he deems it advisable, the Secretary is authorized to make use of such State agencies, facilities, and employees as may be made available to him.

The amendment strikes out all the language after the word "States" on page 25, line 25. The sentence now reads:

In the enforcement of conservation laws, rules, and regulations the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the conservation agencies of the adjacent States.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator explain the purpose of omitting the last words from that sentence? In other words, was it intended to change the meaning or effect of the Senate provision at all?

Mr. CORDON. The purpose of the change as presented to the conference by the House conferees was to make certain there would be no financial obligation on the Federal Government with reference to payment for services of officials of the State.

Mr. DANIEL. In other words, was it the idea of the conference that the Secretary is authorized, in his cooperation, to use the facilities of the States and State officials, if available to him, in enforcing the conservation laws and the conservation programs in the area?

Mr. CORDON. There was no agreement in that field. The agreement was that authority to cooperate with State agencies was adequate to meet the necessities, and the elimination of the language in question would make certain that there was no financial obligation on the part of the Federal Government in connection therewith. I cannot make a better explanation to the Senator from Texas than that.

I called attention to the fact that a colloquy was had on the floor with respect to this amendment, offered by the Senator from Texas, that the record of the colloquy in the Senate would be the best reference as to the meaning of the provision, and that the sponsor of the amendment made the statement on the floor that there was no financial obligation entailed on the Federal Government in such cooperation.

Mr. DANIEL. That is certainly correct. The States expect no payment for any services they render under this provision. It happens to be a case in which State cooperation will help the Federal Government, and the States are not asking for any compensation. The main thing on which I want to be clear is whether the Senator from Oregon understands that under the wording left by the conference the Secretary of the Interior could use any facilities or services which the States wished to make available to him in carrying out or enforcing the conservation laws.

Mr. CORDON. To the extent that such action on the part of the State would be a legal action, the Senator from Oregon is in full agreement. Cooperation certainly cannot be a one-way street. For example, at the present time, in connection with the Mineral Leasing Act and its application to federally owned lands in the several States, there is cooperation between the Federal Government and the States in which those lands lie.

The difference between that situation and the one presented by the outer Continental Shelf is that, with respect to the Mineral Leasing Act, the lands to which the act is applicable are within the boundaries of the State and there is a degree of State jurisdiction. With respect to the outer shelf lands, they are wholly outside the boundary of any State, and there is no jurisdiction on the part of any State. To that extent there cannot be an application of State law under

State jurisdiction. The distinction is an important one which the Senator from Oregon would like to have the Record show.

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to ask one further question. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Oregon that if the Secretary deems it advisable in carrying on this cooperation with the State agencies and officials, he is authorized to make use of such State agencies, facilities, and employees as may be made available to him?

Mr. CORDON. Under existing law, yes, but with special regard to the fact that there is no State jurisdiction on the outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. DANIEL. Yes; and the fact that the States are not to receive any compensation for it.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. The only thing I wish to make clear is that in spite of the fact that the conference has eliminated the last words of this sentence the Secretary will have authority to do exactly what the Senate said when the bill was acted upon in this body.

Mr. CORDON. That appears to be the case, as the Senator from Oregon sees it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the primary responsibility for laying down the conditions for granting leases is to be in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior, and is not to be delegated or farmed out to the respective State authorities?

Mr. CORDON. The bill goes further than that, may I say to the Senator from Illinois. Not only the primary power, but the absolute and complete power, rests in the Secretary. He is acting for the Federal Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So the State authorities will not have the power to determine whether applicant A rather than applicant B shall get a specific lease.

Mr. CORDON. Exactly.

The next amendment is found on page 28, and is a perfecting amendment. In line 11, the words "oil or gas" are to be inserted after the word "such." This is a perfecting amendment to clarify the language in the bill so as clearly to indicate that the pipelines referred to, which may be made common carriers, are pipelines carrying oil or gas, and would not be required to carry sulfur, if technical developments make it possible to transport sulfur in this way.

The next amendment —

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator read the sentence in line 11 to which he has just referred?

Mr. CORDON. It is a long sentence. It begins with the beginning of the paragraph in line 3, and reads as follows:

(c) Rights-of-way through the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, whether or not such lands are included in a lease maintained or issued pursuant to this act, may be granted by the Secretary for pipeline purposes for the transportation of oil, natural gas, sulfur, or other mineral under such regulations and upon such conditions as to the application therefor and the survey, location and width thereof as may be prescribed by the Secretary, and upon the express condition that such oil or gas pipe-

lines shall transport or purchase without discrimination, oil or natural gas produced from said submerged lands in the vicinity of the pipeline in such proportionate amounts as the Federal Power Commission, in the case of gas, and the Interstate Commerce Commission, in the case of oil, may, after a full hearing with due notice thereof to the interested parties, determine to be reasonable taking into account, among other things, conservation and the prevention of waste.

MINIMUM 5-PERCENT ROYALTY ON SULFUR

The next amendment reported for adoption or rejection by the Senate is on page 30 of the bill, in line 24. The amendment there inserts the figure "5" in place of the figure "10," in line 24. The net effect is to reduce the basic or minimum royalty on sulfur from 10 percent to 5 percent.

In connection with this change the conference had before it a letter from the Secretary of the Interior indicating that such investigation as his Department could make revealed that a basic royalty of 5 percent was probably more realistic than 10 percent. Secretary McKay added that in any event the Interior Department would attempt to secure the higher royalty in its call for bids for sulfur leases in the area.

The next amendment is on page 31, in line 12. It is wholly a perfecting amendment. The word "the" is inserted after the phrase "and thereafter pays to" and before the word "Secretary", so that the language will read: "and thereafter pays to the Secretary."

CHANGE IN DATE

On page 32 is found the next amendment. It is the substitution of the date "June 5, 1950," for the date "December 11, 1950," appearing in lines 20 and 21. The change was made at the urging of several conferees, in order that any operator in the area who had drilled and found oil might have the benefit of the provision for extension of primary term of lease, if there was production of oil on June 5, the date of the decision in the Louisiana and Texas cases, but oil was not being produced on December 11, the date of the decree and injunctions.

The representation made to us was that the lessees were in effect precluded from doing anything in the way of operations after the date of the decisions in the Texas and Louisiana cases on June 5, 1950. Under the former language a lessee might lose a lease because the production from a well that might have kept it alive happened to stop in November 1950. Since our purpose was to validate the leases that were being operated and held in good faith, the argument was made that the date might well be changed as suggested. Thus, the equities a lessee had under the situation just outlined would be protected.

The next amendment is on page 33, line 7, and is purely a perfecting amendment, the words "subsection (b)" being stricken, and the word "section" being made "subsection." The last change is at the end of the line.

The next amendment is on page 34, in line 22. The words "Disclaimer and" are stricken from the title of the section. The language as adopted by the Senate excluded any power for disclaimer, and

the amendment was made simply to make the title responsive to the section.

The next amendment is amendment No. 13, on page 35, line 2, and is purely a perfecting amendment, the letter "(c)" being stricken and the letter "(b)" being inserted. It is done merely to correct the reference.

SULFUR LEASING PROVISIONS

On the page 38 of the bill there is amendment No. 14. The language in the bill was changed in lines 11 and 12 beginning in lines 11 and 12. Beginning on line 11 the words "require the payment of a royalty of not less than 10 percent of the value of the sulfur" was deleted and the following language inserted: "require the payment to the United States of such royalty as may be specified in the lease but not less than 5 percent of the gross production or value of the sulfur."

The change brings the new leasing section in proper relationship to the section respecting existing State leases wherein the sulfur lease royalty minimum was reduced from 10 to 5 percent. The language was suggested by the Department of the Interior and adopted by the conference.

On page 39 appears amendment No. 16. It is line 7. The language "this section 8 of this act" is stricken, and after the word "act" the word "or" is inserted.

In line 9, after the word "act" the language down to and including the word "act" is stricken. That is amendment No. 17. The two amendments go together, so I have tied them together for the purpose of explanation. The language as it reads now, beginning with the paragraph in line 6, reads as follows:

(h) The issuance of any lease by the Secretary pursuant to this act, or the making of any interim arrangements by the Secretary pursuant to section 7 of this act shall not prejudice the ultimate settlement or adjudication of the question as to whether or not the area involved is in the outer Continental Shelf.

That again is a perfecting amendment.

THE HILL AMENDMENT

We come now to the controversial Hill amendment, which is section 9, beginning in line 21 on page 39 of H. R. 5134 as amended by the Senate.

In accordance with the agreement in conference, section 9 is stricken in its entirety, and new language substituted. The section reported by the conferees simply makes the necessary provision under the action taken for deposit of all receipts in the Treasury, and the language reads:

All rentals, royalties, and other sums paid to the Secretary or the Secretary of the Navy under any lease on the outer Continental Shelf for the period from June 5, 1950, to date, and thereafter shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States and credited to miscellaneous receipts.

That would be the ordinary route for the money to take in this type of case.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the oil for education amendment, otherwise known as the Hill amendment, was

passed by the Senate by a vote of 47 to 35?

Mr. CORDON. My memory tells me it was a vote of 45 to 37 but in any event the figures are reasonably correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that the House has never voted on the oil-for-education amendment?

Mr. CORDON. That is technically correct. The House has not voted on the amendment separately, as a single amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was the point the Senator from Illinois wished to make. So the conferees on the part of the House had no clear mandate to turn down the oil-for-education amendment.

Mr. CORDON. That is a matter of judgment on the part of the individual. The conferees felt they had.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The conferees wanted to turn it down, but did they have a mandate to turn it down?

Mr. CORDON. Their view was that they did.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is there any record showing that the House of Representatives turned down the oil-for-education amendment when it was presented separately to them? Was it ever presented separately to them?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon cannot answer that question with certainty. It was not presented as such in this particular measure. The Senator is correct that far. He may be correct all the way.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is my understanding that in the consideration of the Continental Shelf bill, the House did not separately consider the oil-for-education amendment. It is also my understanding that the House did consider two oil-for-education amendments in connection with the so-called tidelands bill this year, and that it so considered it in earlier years, although I have not checked back to see the actual record of the earlier years. I did check back on the record for this year, and there were two separate amendments by which the House rejected the oil-for-education amendment in the consideration of the tidelands bill, not the Continental Shelf bill.

Mr. CORDON. My researches show that that is the correct statement of the situation with reference to the House form of the bill. The House considered a bill dealing with the entire Continental Shelf, in which both lands within State boundaries and the outer areas beyond were included as a part of a complete bill. To that extent the oil-for-education amendment was a clear presentation of the problem, but there was involved—in order that we may have the complete picture before us—the other question, with respect to Federal control over the submerged lands within State boundaries.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Oregon is correct in his statement. The House tidelands bill was enlarged above as compared to what the Senate passed in the way of a tidelands bill, and did include, in addition to the tidelands, so-called, that is, the submerged lands

within State boundaries, all lands outside State boundaries which comprehend the outer Continental Shelf, which is covered by this bill.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The truth is there has been no vote in the House of Representatives on the oil-for-education amendment, except that the oil-for-education amendment was embodied in the provisions of two complete bills, which provided for Federal control of the submerged land resources from the low-water mark seaward to the so-called tidelands, as well as outer Continental Shelf. Those two bills were offered as substitutes for what we called the Holland joint resolution or so-called Holland bill, which dealt with the so-called tidelands. But the oil-for-education amendments were only provisions inserted in the overall bills, including both the tidelands and the outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Alabama to say that the two amendments considered by the House of Representatives this year in considering their tidelands bill, including not only lands within but also lands without the State boundaries, were not applicable to oil for education?

Mr. HILL. No; they were a part of the substitute bills, and the substitute bills included both the so-called tidelands and the outer Continental Shelf. They were substitutes for the so-called tidelands bill the House of Representatives passed, which bill was analogous to what we knew in the Senate as the so-called Holland joint resolution, frequently referred to as the Holland bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is not my understanding. My understanding is that two amendments embracing the so-called oil-for-education philosophy were submitted and were passed upon by the House of Representatives.

Mr. HILL. Let me say that I have the record before me, and those amendments were not voted upon separately. As a matter of fact, last year the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], then a member of the House of Representatives, offered the oil-for-education amendment to the then so-called tidelands bill, the Walter bill. But the amendment went out on a point of order; it was held to be out of order.

There has been no vote in the House of Representatives on the so-called oil-for-education amendment, as an amendment, but only as a provision of a bill offered as a substitute for the so-called tidelands bill the House passed, namely, the bill relating to both the so-called tidelands and the outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. There was in the House, in days gone by, a vote on the application of these revenues to the payment of

the principal of the national debt. Such an amendment was adopted a year or two ago in the House of Representatives. Was there any discussion in the conference committee of the possibility that if the House could not agree on Federal aid for education, the proceeds should be applied to the national debt rather than placed into miscellaneous receipts?

Mr. CORDON. There was such discussion, up to the time of the closing of the last meeting, 2 days ago. The managers on the part of the Senate urged that the managers on the part of the House agree to a simple sequestering of the funds, and provide that they be held in suspense for a period of, as first suggested, 5 years, and, as later suggested, 3 years, and not be available for appropriation until affirmative action was taken by Congress. That proposal also was made, but was rejected.

Mr. DANIEL. Was any vote taken in conference on the matter of applying the funds to the principal of the national debt?

Mr. CORDON. No formal vote was taken on it. An informal poll was taken on the matter, and it was rejected.

Mr. DANIEL. It has always been my thought that a good way to use these funds would be to apply them to the principal of the national debt. From what I hear today, that still seems to be a good idea.

Mr. CORDON. There is no doubt that we need to have some funds applied to the national debt; there can be no question about that.

DELETION OF HILL AMENDMENT

Mr. President, the change resulting from the action of a majority of the managers for the Senate would be to eliminate section 9, appearing on pages 39 and 40, and at the same time section 16, appearing on pages 44 and 45, beginning in line 24 on page 44. That section carries the language of the amendment to the Hill bill which was offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and was adopted by the Senate.

Mr. President, before I discuss the major question, let me finish calling attention to the amendments which otherwise appear in the conference report.

PROVISION FOR REFUNDS

Amendment No. 19 appears on page 40, in line 19: After the word "payment", to strike out the period and insert the word "or the effective date of this act." The amendment provides that requests for overpayments may be made within 2 years after payment; or if payment was made prior to the enactment of this act, and if that period was more than 2 years prior, the request may be made within 2 years after the effective date of the act, in any event.

The Senate provided that certain notice be given to Congress with respect to any refunds. The bill as passed by the Senate provided for such notice to be transmitted by the bodies to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of each body. It happens that this matter was considered by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives. So the language was changed, so as to read, "to the appropriate legislative committee of each body."

Amendment No. 20 appears on page 41, and is, again, a perfecting amendment.

NO AUTHORITY TO TERMINATE LEASES

On page 42 appears amendment No. 21, in line 10, and again in line 13. That amendment strikes out the language which would give the Secretary of the Interior, upon a recommendation of the Secretary of State, during a period of war or national emergency, the right to terminate leases. He would still have the right to suspend operation under leases, but not to terminate leases; and the words "or to terminate", in line 10, are stricken out; and in lines 13 and 14 the words "or whose lease is thus terminated" are also stricken out.

Amendment No. 22 appears on page 42, in line 17. It is a purely perfecting amendment. It would strike out the word "the" in the latter portion of that line.

Amendment No. 23 appears on page 44, and is a perfecting amendment. The word "in" is substituted for the word "on," in line 7—in that line, the word "on" is the second word; and in line 14, the word "in" is substituted for the word "of," which is the first word in that line.

IMPLEMENTATION OF HILL AMENDMENT DELETED

Amendment No. 24 is to section 16. I have described this amendment. It is a portion of the amendment to the Hill amendment. The whole section is stricken out.

There is a further change—purely a perfecting amendment—in line 22, and there is a change in the section number, and there is a like change in line 25.

Mr. President, that completes the list of the changes. It is clear that there is no major change in the sense of the act, except as to the use of the revenues which may arise under the act.

ACTION ON HILL PROPOSAL PRACTICAL

Mr. President, first, I address myself to that question. I shall be brief.

As I see it, and as the majority of the conferees saw it, this is wholly a practical question at this time. Your conferees—both the majority and the minority members—did everything they could to obtain agreement by the conferees on the part of the House with the action taken by the Senate. When they could not get that, they sought agreement on something in lieu of that action.

They were advised—and I am sure the minority members will concur in my statement—by the managers on the part of the House that they had their directions regarding this matter, namely, not to recede in any respect, at any time, on this point. We were given to understand that, rather than recede, the managers on the part of the House simply would not make a report to the House. We were in favor of having the whole matter in disagreement taken back to the House. The House managers advised that they would not so report. Under the circumstances, the Senate conferees were unanimous in feeling that the matter was of sufficient importance to justify presenting it to the Senate and requesting the Senate to take action.

JURISDICTION OVER OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

Mr. President, we have here a bill giving legislative weight to and implementing the claim now made by the United States of jurisdiction over the subsoil of a vast outer Continental Shelf along the shores of the United States. There are known to be valuable deposits of minerals, chiefly oil and gas, but also sulfur and perhaps other minerals, within the Gulf area, and there is reason to believe there may be such deposits along the Atlantic and Pacific seaboard. Those deposits cannot be explored or developed without statutory authority. There is no law that now appertains to the areas where these deposits exist, other than the law of the open sea. They are not areas over which there is absolute sovereignty on the part of the United States. They are peculiar in that respect, and the application of law must be by congressional action. Otherwise there will be no law, except maritime law, applicable to the waters above the Continental Shelf. It is imperative that the implementation be made; and it is vital to the United States that it be made at as early a date as possible. There has been a cessation of exploration and the investment of large amounts of capital for the production of oil and gas, as a result of injunctions which were issued in December 1950.

NO DEVELOPMENT BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

There is no way by which this job can be done except as it might be done by the Federal Government itself. There are no funds made available along that line, nor has any fund been requested; nor, I imagine, would any be granted. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama, as amended by the Senator from Arkansas, and agreed to by the Senate, is one which requires additional affirmative legislative action before it is implemented. The funds accruing from operations on the outer Continental Shelf can be made available for such dedication, or for any other purpose other than that of national defense, during the next 3 years.

Under those circumstances, and faced by an action on the part of the House indicative of a determination that the House would legislate on the outer Shelf only, and would require any legislation with respect to the disposition of funds to go to the legislative committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter for which disposition was intended, the conferees on the part of the Senate felt that it was better to bring the bill to the Senate floor. This action gives the Senate an opportunity to concur, to agree to the conference report, and to enact the bill without reference to this or any other particular or specific application of the funds. Thus, action can go forward, which must go forward if there are to be any funds, beyond those that are now available, produced for any purpose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would it be fair to say that the House Managers staged a threatened sit-down strike in order to coerce the conferees on the part of the Senate?

Mr. CORDON. The condition was as the Senator from Oregon has presented it; and one may characterize it in various ways. We were faced with a condition, not a theory.

PRINCIPLE OF HILL AMENDMENT NOT
ENDANGERED

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to accept the conference report. I believe it can accept it without any danger to whatever rights might be created were the Hill amendment to remain in the bill. Inasmuch as legislation must be passed before any funds can ever be allocated or paid to any State or agency, or for the benefit of any school child, we would be in no worse position if we were to pass the bill now, and then turn to the subject matter of disposition of the fund, since, under the terms of the Hill bill, there would have been 3 years within which to work out that disposition. We can do that if we accept the conference report, pass the bill, and provide legislation under which that action can be taken which it is necessary to take if revenues are to accrue from the outer shelf henceforth.

That can be done without prejudice to the disposition of the funds. That can be done and the question of disposition be resolved any time within 3 years without the loss of \$1 of revenue, if we are to assume that there is loss of revenue if the funds go into the Treasury as general revenues and are applied for general governmental purposes. If we are to look at this matter as one of protecting only education in this country, there is no loss to education if we take this road.

My position with reference to the Hill amendment was made plain on the Senate floor. Nevertheless, it has been my position, here as always, that if I serve on a conference, my obligation to the Senate is to protect as far as possible the integrity of the Senate and the action taken by the Senate. That was the view taken by all of the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONFERENCE REPORT WOULD BRING IN
REVENUES

When we were faced with an impasse, when we were face to face with the fact that there could be no report except a report of disagreement on this side, in which the House conferees refused to participate, it seemed to be just practical, sound, good sense to bring to the Senate that portion of the bill upon which agreement could be reached, and to give the Senate an opportunity to ratify the action of its conferees. By accepting the conference report we get an outer shelf bill on the statute books, under which revenue could commence to come in for whatever purpose the Congress might deem it should be used, including, of course, the purpose set out in the Hill amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not also a fact that, whether the Hill amendment remained in the bill or not, not one penny could go to the schools until Congress had passed a bill authorizing Federal aid to schools, involving the trouble-

some question of whether it should be limited to the public schools or should be given to both public and parochial schools, as well as other types of schools?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct. It is perfectly apparent that that is the situation. The Senator from Oregon is already being deluged with telegrams, many of them couched in exactly the same language, and all of them urging that the word "public" be inserted before the word "education."

The question is already abroad, and the discussion will become hotter as the days and months go by. We shall have to settle it finally. We face a necessity not only of determining the religious or public versus private school question, but also the question of allocation, the question of what yardstick is to be used, and for what purpose in the field of education the money is to be used. All of those questions we must face, under either approach.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon if it is not true that one of the House conferees was in favor of the oil-for-education amendment? I did not consider the other House conferees as being adamant against it. They seemed to assume that the Senate conferees would recede. They did not make any strong argument or give any sound justification for their position, but they acted as though they expected us to recede.

Mr. CORDON. Of course, every man looks at a picture through his own eyes. They stated emphatically, not once but many times, that on this matter they stood 6 to 1 and that they were going to stand 6 to 1, and would not report the amendment back to the House.

The Senator from Montana was not always present.

Mr. MURRAY. I was there all the time.

Mr. CORDON. Then the Senator was hiding from the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MURRAY. I was sitting right next to the Senator from Oregon. Maybe I was so close to him that he could not see me.

Mr. CORDON. Usually the Senator from Montana makes himself heard. I am happy to say that the Senator took part in the discussion and worked through it. I was under the impression that during a portion of the time the Senator was not present.

Mr. MURRAY. I know I was there all the time.

Mr. CORDON. Then the Senator from Oregon is mistaken and he regrets his mistake.

Mr. MURRAY. It seems to me that there was no such position taken by the other conferees on the part of the House. They were quiet about it. They assumed that the Senate conferees would recede. That is the way I understood it. I did not hear any very vociferous objections to the oil-for-education amendment.

Mr. CORDON. I can only say to the Senator from Montana that the Senator and I differ with respect to what was said and how it was said. I can understand the Senator's view, but I will have

to let each member of the conference speak for himself. I should like to have the Members of the House speak for themselves on this floor as they did in the conference. I know the situation which faced us was one that had to have either this answer, or, in this session, no answer.

MAJORITY OF CONFEREES APPROVED

I am presenting the matter to the Members of the Senate as the action of a majority of the conferees. The Senator from New Mexico was in complete agreement with all the actions taken except the action with respect to the Hill amendment as amended. The Senator from Montana did not sign the report. I am sure he is fully able to present his own reasons. I believe he was in accord with the actions taken except that taken on the Hill amendment.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to accept the conference report, to get this bill on the statute books, and the oil, gas, and sulfur, if we can find it, produced so that we may have something about which we may fruitfully legislate, namely, dollars in the Treasury.

THE DULUTH (MINN.) AIRPORT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I regret that I must digress from the subject matter which is before the Senate, because I believe in the rule of germaneness. I am very much interested in the conference report which is under consideration, but I want to discuss for a few minutes a situation which I think is so unreasonable that it is almost unbelievable. It is so unrealistic that it shows the most irresponsible judgment on the part of high officials in the Government. I can bring it to a point very readily.

The city of Duluth, Minn., has an airport constructed with Federal funds. It was constructed during the period of the war and after the war as part of our defense program. This airport has been used for the past few years as a commercial airport, and, more recently, at the direction of the Secretary of Defense, as an air-defense post.

The city of Duluth is one of the large port cities in the United States. It is a major port for the shipment of iron ore. I understand that in tonnage it is the second largest port in the United States. A large portion of the iron ore resources is located from 75 to 100 miles from the city of Duluth. Railroads bring the ore to the port where it can be shipped to the great furnaces in Chicago, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, and other areas in the eastern section of the United States.

Mr. President, here is the problem. The appropriations for the Civil Aeronautics Administration, according to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, were reduced to a point where the CAA feels it must curtail a number of its control towers at airports.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield in order that I may join him in his comments, because I have a committee engagement which will require me to leave the floor of the Senate at about 5 o'clock.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I will say to my colleague that I share the same concern he is now

expressing about closing down the control tower at the Duluth Airport.

When the information that the control tower was to be closed down first came to my attention, I immediately contacted the CAA and was informed that there were not sufficient flights in and out of the airport to justify continuing the control tower. I tried to obtain further information concerning it, and was told there was a schedule of flights and if the airport did not have such a schedule of flights they could not furnish the service. They said the Duluth Airport fell below the particular schedule of flights the Commission had established.

I then went to the military authorities and found that they were of the opinion that the control tower was a function of CAA. I had gone back and forth about four times, and I finally said, "Wait a minute. You are going to tell me specifically who has the responsibility."

I finally was told by the CAA "We cannot continue operating the control tower unless there is a certain number of flights every day. If we make an exception in Duluth we will have to do it in other cases."

The Air Service said it was not their responsibility.

I say to my colleagues that we want to get this thing nailed down so that we will know who is going to control that tower. At least, we shall not give up until someone does control it.

It is located in a strategic area, as my colleague has ably stated, with reference to shipments of ore. We are going to find out how we can get this control tower continued, and the last step which has been taken was to communicate with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] will receive from the Secretary of Defense a letter which will specifically give assurance that the towers will be operated by the Air Service. If such a letter is not received then my colleague and I had better get together and do the things which will have to be done in order that the tower may be continued. But the last information I have is that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has been in communication with the Secretary of Defense. There is no question in my mind that the military have the funds. It is only a question of their assuming that the airport in Duluth is of sufficient strategic importance as to warrant continuance of operation of the control tower.

I desired to make this explanation to my colleague as to what the Committee on Appropriations has done in the last 12 hours on the matter. If we do not get proper results from this action, we shall have to take another step, and see what else we can do.

It is not a question of appropriating funds for CAA; it is a question of the military assuming the responsibility, and the military has funds with which to do it.

I share the same conviction as my colleague. I do not intend to stand idly by and see the control tower service discontinued, because it is too impor-

tant. It is entirely too important to our national security, and we should make certain that nothing happens in the vicinity of the iron ore docks at Duluth and Superior.

I wish to thank my colleague for discussing the matter at a time when we were both on the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the senior Senator from Minnesota for his keen interest in the matter, because in our respective calls to departments about our troubles, we frequently find that one or the other of us has already called.

I wish to help the Appropriations Committee today. I want to serve warning right now that there will not be a rafter left in the Senate Chamber unless the Department of Defense gets busy and takes care of the job of defending this country. The situation is so incredible, that it is, as I have said, unbelievable, absolutely preposterous.

Duluth, Minn., has an air defense unit, the 515th Air Defense Group has a squadron of F-51D fighter planes. It has about 3 jets. I understand it will soon be receiving more modern jets. It is a major air defense installation. It has two C-47's and one trainer plane.

The Federal Government has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars at Duluth for storage facilities, a dispensary, and land acquisition. There is an Air National Guard unit using the airport. The naval air station at Wold-Chamberlain Field, at Minneapolis, uses the airport as a base for activities in the bombing ranges it has in the cut-over areas of Minnesota, where they practice with live ammunition and bombs.

Mr. President, do you know how much is involved in the request to continue the operation of the airport control tower? Eleven thousand dollars. That is not even postage dollars for the Air Force.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration insists it does not have the necessary funds. The Air Force, which has the funds, will not transfer the money.

The mayor of Duluth was in Washington around the first of July, and he met with representatives of the Air Force. A transfer of \$11,000 to the CAA would keep the tower in operation. In that area are modern facilities, thousands of dollars of equipment paid for by the taxpayers.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I have received from the staff of the Appropriations Committee a letter which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and I had discussed earlier in the day. The letter is in draft form, and a member of the staff has just brought it to me. Would it be of interest to the junior Senator from Minnesota to have it read, in order to show just what the Committee on Appropriations is endeavoring to do with respect to the matter? We have only until July 31 to obtain a decision.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to my colleague that I should like to complete my thought, and then I will yield to him. But I recall that my colleague must at-

tend a committee meeting. Is that correct?

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague may read the letter.

Mr. THYE. This may follow the remarks of my colleague, so that it does not interfere with his complete statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With that understanding, it is so ordered.

Mr. THYE. This is the letter we discussed, which it was suggested should be addressed to the Secretary of Defense:

JULY 30, 1953.

HON. CHARLES E. WILSON,

Secretary of Defense,

Department of Defense,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the course of testimony before the Appropriations Committee on Department of Defense appropriations, Air Force witnesses brought out the fact that the Civil Aeronautics Authority had served notice on the Department of Air Force that due to budgetary cuts control towers at Duluth, Minn., and Niagara Falls, N. Y., would be discontinued effective July 31, 1953.

Apparently the two airports in question do not meet the criteria established by the Civil Aeronautics Authority as to required number of landings and takeoffs in order to keep a control tower operational.

Air Force witnesses testified (p. 1664, Department of Defense appropriation hearings) operation of control towers at Duluth and Niagara Falls are militarily necessary and that the Air Force would find some means to keep them operational in the event the Civil Aeronautics Authority discontinued operation. It is suggested, therefore, that the Air Force take the necessary steps to make certain that the control towers at Duluth and Niagara Falls be made sufficiently operational to meet military requirements.

Sincerely yours,

STYLES BRIDGES,

Chairman.

I thank my colleague for the courtesy of yielding. I regret that my commitment is such that I must be on my way.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate hearing the letter read. I hope it will accomplish the desired results. But in order to make doubly sure it attains the desired results, I am going to read the alleged riot act for a few moments.

The Air Force had plenty of opportunity, if it needed more money to keep the air station open, to suggest it to the Senate. The Civil Aeronautics Administration can accept money from the Air Force, if the Air Force transfers it.

It so happened that the Secretary of Defense put his foot down and said that the Department of Defense would not transfer it for that purpose.

I say to my fellow Senators that Duluth, Minn., is the farthest northern port in the central United States for the defense of this Nation. Finland, Minn., has one of the largest radar stations for the defense of the North American Continent.

So help me, this economy-minded administration is so filled with a desire to save another \$10,000 that it is jeopardizing the security of the radar station, the port of Duluth, the rail facilities, iron mines, and airfields. Millions of dollars of air-defense equipment is stationed at Duluth. I cannot understand the rea-

soning. I do not know how there can be such bureaucratic confusion.

All that is needed is to have a transfer of funds from the Air Force to the Civil Aeronautics Administration. But what do they say? The CAA says, "We did not get it in our budget," and the Air Force states "We are not going to give it from our budget." They are acting like a couple of children; and in the midst of them is Grandpa Wilson. In the midst of them is the Secretary of Defense, who will not permit \$11,000 to be transferred in order to maintain a control tower on an important air-defense installation.

If the Secretary of Defense thinks he has heard the last of this, believe me, he has another think coming. I am not going to stand idly by and see one of the finest airports in America, in which the Federal Government has invested millions of dollars for defense, stand without a control tower. This would be like having an automobile without a carburetor.

The City Council of Duluth passed a resolution unanimously saying that it would no longer take responsibility for having the airfield open if there was no control tower to guide the passage of planes.

What is this so-called standard of the Civil Aeronautics Administration? The standard by which the CAA rules out the control tower in Duluth Airport. That ruling was based on 1952 reports. Since 1952 the Air Force has doubled its installations. In 1954 more airplanes are going to be put in this same airport. In the meantime, what is going to happen? I will tell the Senate what is going to happen. We will have economy. This kind of economy:

The Air Force will equip a jeep or an expensive truck with control-tower equipment. It requires from 5 to 10 men to operate it on a 24-hour basis. At the same time, in a building nearby there are thousands of dollars worth of control-tower equipment, but under the control of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Those two agencies are not speaking to each other. The way they act, one wonders if they are in the same country. Yet, one is on Constitution Avenue and the other in the Pentagon Building. One would think that one of the agencies was the Soviet Union and the other the United States.

I am fed up with this nonsense. I serve warning on the Secretary of Defense and upon the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration that they had better get their heads together and get that \$11,000 out there pretty darn quick.

Our defense command post will close down on August 1. If the Secretary of Defense, who has the responsibility of defending the country, wants to close down a major defense installation because of unwillingness to make an expenditure of \$11,000, believe me, he will have some explaining to do to the people of my State and the people of the country. The shortest route from Moscow to America happens to be over the great circle route, via the North Pole; and the first American air station they run into is at Duluth, Minn., and the first radar station at Finland, Minn. I suppose Mr.

Wilson does not know that. I presume the reason is that one cannot drive an Oldsmobile over that route.

I am burned to a crisp over this matter. I may march out of this Chamber and over to the Pentagon and give Mr. Wilson a globe of the world. He has been looking at flat maps for too long.

I ask Mr. Wilson, who is in charge of the Defense Establishment, to call in one of the subordinates in the Department of the Air Force. All he has to do is to say to one of those fine public servants—and there are many of them—"Dig down into the kitty. We have billions of dollars in unobligated funds." They have so much that they hardly know what to do with it, according to what I heard last week. All Mr. Wilson needs to do is to say, "Dig down in the little bag and take out a few pieces of silver. You do not even have to take the gold. Get some silver—\$11,000 worth—and keep open an air control-tower station."

What a problem. They must be spending hours figuring this one out. This really requires the mind of a giant. Good grief—my 9-year-old son could figure this one out with much less confusion than exists in that high-priced establishment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I was interested in the statement with respect to the unobligated funds for Air Force construction. In the case of Air Force construction alone, I notice that in that particular category, at the present time, there is slightly less than \$2 billion of unobligated appropriations for public works construction in the Air Force.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does not the Senator understand that when the Department is considering a figure of \$11,000, a figure we never even hear about nowadays, it does not even know what to do with \$11,000? If we were to ask for a gold-plated tower, perhaps we would get \$110 million.

We are simple folks out there. I use that term in the best sense of the word. All we want is \$11,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the Senator think he might be able to get the \$11,000 if he guaranteed to construct an officers' club, with a swimming pool for the summertime and a skating rink for the winter?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That problem requires thought. We may try to work on it. If we had that kind of installation, we would have no trouble.

The trouble is that Duluth, Minn., has only one airline operating into it, the North-Central. It is quite an important city. It has a big steel plant. There are iron mines nearby, which I understand are quite important to the economy of the country. It is a great port facility.

Furthermore, the trouble is that it is far off in the north country. It is so much nicer for the Air Force to build all its installations where the climate is warm, soft, and balmy. Of course, wars are not always fought in that kind of climate. But that is a good place to

train. Wars are fought where it is cold. The last word I had about the Siberian climate was to the effect that it was even colder than the coldest areas in northern Minnesota.

When we talk about the defense of the country, when it comes to a suggestion which does not happen to involve an area alongside the Riviera, the Department of Defense says, "We had better save that \$11,000. We may need some new chairs for the club."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would it not be possible to make this project attractive to the Air Force and Secretary if the swimming pool could be enclosed? Then it would be possible to have a hothouse atmosphere, with tropical plants, and the water could be electrically heated in the wintertime, so that the various officials would enjoy the swimming.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. That is an accurate description of some things which have developed.

I do not want to be unkind to the Air Force, but I want to tell them that they are going to have some trouble unless we get this money.

This project does not mean anything to me personally. Very likely I shall not fly up there within the next few days. I should be more likely to drive up in my Oldsmobile.

Candidly, it is nothing short of shameful that my distinguished colleague [Mr. THYE], who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, the junior Senator from Minnesota who is likewise somewhat active in the Senate, and the Representative from the eighth district, Congressman JOHN BLATNIK, who has been in the House for years, have been pleading with two agencies of Government for the small sum of \$11,000. Yet those bookkeepers and supersonic managers cannot find out how to get \$11,000 to us.

I warn the Department of Defense that if it does not get busy and if the officials do not make up their minds as to how to operate this installation, there will be no airport.

The airport happens to be in the control of the city of Duluth. The officials in the Department of Defense had better realize this. The mayor of the town is named Johnson. He is part Norwegian and part Swedish. When those Scandinavian people make up their minds, they make them up for good.

Let me read the resolution adopted by the City Council of Duluth:

By Mayor Johnson:

"Whereas a traffic control tower is a necessity at the Duluth Airport; and

"Whereas the discontinuance of Duluth control tower would result in great danger and hazard to human life and limb; and

"Whereas the city of Duluth cannot and will not be a party to a situation such as the discontinuance of the local control tower would cause to exist: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Duluth Airport cease operations and be closed at the same time that said control tower ceases its traffic control functions;

"Resolved further, That the city clerk be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to send copies of this resolution to Hon.

John A. Blatnik, Congressman; Hon. Edward J. Thye and Hubert H. Humphrey, Senators; and to Mr. F. B. Lee, Administrator, Department of Commerce, CAA, Washington, D. C.; and Mr. L. L. Schroeder, Commissioner of Aeronautics, St. Paul, Minn."

Mayor Johnson moved the adoption of the resolution, and it was declared adopted upon the following vote: Yeas: Commissioners Badin, Fiskett, Priley, Mayor Johnson—4. Nays: None.

Approved July 29, 1953.

I, C. D. Jeronimus, city clerk of the city of Duluth, in the State of Minnesota, do hereby certify that I have compared the annexed copy of resolution passed by the city council of the city of Duluth, on the 29th day of July 1953, with the original document and record thereof on file and of record in my office, and in my custody as city clerk of said city, and that the same is a true and correct copy thereof, and the whole thereof, and a true and correct transcript therefrom.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the corporate seal of said city of Duluth this 29th day of July 1953.

C. D. JERONIMUS,
City Clerk, City of Duluth, Minn.

EXCERPT FROM COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS OF JULY 29, 1953—FROM THE MINUTES OF THE AIRPORT BOARD MEETING HELD 11 A. M., JULY 29, 1953

Mr. Hagberg moved, seconded by Mr. Butler, that the airport board recommend to the city council that the airport be closed unless the control tower is in continuous operation because of the danger to human life in using the airport with the amount of flying that is being done with both civilian and Air Force traffic.

The above motion was unanimously adopted.

I, C. D. Jeronimus, city clerk of the city of Duluth, in the State of Minnesota, do hereby certify that I have compared the annexed copy of excerpt from council proceedings of the city of Duluth, on the 29th day of July 1953, with the original document and record thereof on file and of record in my office, and in my custody as city clerk of said city, and that the same is a true and correct copy thereof, and the whole thereof, and a true and correct transcript therefrom.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the corporate seal of said city of Duluth, this 29th day of July 1953.

C. D. JERONIMUS,
City Clerk, City of Duluth, Minn.

Mr. President, what is going to happen? Let me tell the Senate how the Government operates. The city government of Duluth will close down the airport. The Federal Government may think it operates it, but it does not. The city government is going to close down the airport. Then, Mr. President, do you know what is going to happen? The Department of Defense is going to say, "We must have that airport," and it will cost the Federal Government \$500,000 a year to operate it, when it can be kept going now for \$11,000.

I have stated my case. I wish to conclude by saying that I appeal to my colleagues to consider this critical situation. It happens in other places.

By August 1, 1953, unless the Secretary of Defense can make up his mind what to do about such a fantastic sum as \$11,000, which he can transfer to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, a major airport, in which the Government of the United States has millions of dollars invested, and a major air defense installation, the 515th Air Defense Group,

will be without a control tower; and without a control tower planes cannot be flown safely in the climate of Minnesota, particularly in the wintertime, when we have blizzards, sleet, and snow.

If this is what is called efficient management of the armed services, God help America. I appeal to the Secretary of Defense while I am influenced by the spirit of compassion and kindness, to make up his mind to do something about this situation. If necessary, I will make this speech all over again, twice as loud and twice as long, so that it can penetrate the Pentagon Building directly, without benefit of telephone.

JURISDICTION OVER SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I regret that the majority of the Senate conferees did not see fit to bring back in disagreement the bill for the development of the outer Continental Shelf, which would have made it possible, without voting down the conference report, to get a direct vote again by the Senate on the oil-for-education amendment. As the situation now stands, however, the conferees having not seen fit to follow the course of reporting a disagreement, but having signed the conference report and agreed to it, the only course open to the Senate is to vote down and reject the conference report.

That is what I very much hope the Senate will do. If the Senate will do it, we will have an opportunity to instruct the Senate conferees further with reference to the oil-for-education amendment.

The chairman of the Senate conferees, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] has told the Senate very candidly and very frankly that six of the House conferees simply sat there in the conference and said to the Senate conferees, "We will do nothing about this unless you agree to abandon, to desert, the oil-for-education amendment."

The oil-for-education amendment was agreed to by the Senate by a vote of 45 to 37. I may say that along with the oil-for-education amendment, and complementary to it, was the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. The House conferees sat there—six of them—six out of a membership of 435—and said, "Either throw out the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, together with the oil-for-education amendment, or we do nothing. We will just sit here. We will not even take the bill back to the House of Representatives and report a disagreement."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The amendment referred to by the distinguished Senator

from Alabama as the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas is the amendment which was actually offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, but I had offered it previously. Certainly the amendment did no violence in any way to the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Alabama. It was my purpose, in supporting the amendment and in cosponsoring it, to implement and strengthen the amendment of the Senator from Alabama, which I was happy to support.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Arkansas supported the oil-for-education amendment and, as he has said, it was very definitely his intention and his desire to strengthen the amendment and to strengthen the cause of the amendment when he supported the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota to which the Senate agreed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. May I ask what the situation is? Unfortunately I had to be out of the Chamber on committee work and on other matters. Are we in the situation that we must either vote to accept the report of the conference or to reject it and send it back for further conference?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Arkansas has accurately stated the situation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is not necessary to move to send it back?

Mr. HILL. No. The question will come on the agreement to the conference report. On that question I hope the Senate will vote "nay," and thereby reject the conference report. If the Senate will do that, we can insist on the Senate amendment, and ask for a further conference; and the Senate can even go further, by giving instructions to its conferees with reference to the oil-for-education amendment, or any other provision in the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I hope the Senate will not hastily accept the conference report under these circumstances, because I feel the conferees on the part of the House have not given the matter the serious consideration and understanding it deserves. I had hoped that the Senator's amendment would be retained so that we might make that much further progress toward a solution of the entire problem. There is still lacking a working out of a proper and clear formula for the allocation of the funds.

Mr. HILL. But there would be a definite dedication of the funds to education, insuring and guaranteeing that the funds would be so applied.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The effect of the amendment would be to dedicate the funds, but there would be left the working out of a satisfactory formula.

Mr. HILL. Yes. I thank the Senator for what he has had to say, and I emphasize to him, as I sought to emphasize earlier, that there has never been in the other House a vote on the oil-for-education amendment, except as it was a provision, along with a number of other provisions, in a bill offered as a substitute. When the distinguished Senator

from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], then a Member of the House, last year offered the amendment to the so-called tidelands bill, it was ruled out on a point of order. This year Representative FEIGHAN, of Ohio offered a substitute for the so-called tidelands oil bill, which embodied not only a provision for oil-for-education, but also carried many provisions, taking in not only the so-called tidelands but also the lands on the outer Continental Shelf.

Representative PERKINS offered a similar substitute proposal, and that proposal carried with it not only the oil-for-education amendment, but also many other provisions dealing with so-called tidelands and dealing with the lands on the outer Continental Shelf.

So it is absolutely correct and accurate to state that the House has never had an opportunity to vote on an oil-for-education proposal, except as tied in with and as one provision in other bills dealing with the resources of the submerged lands.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not quite understand the situation with respect to the conferees not reaching an agreement on the amendment.

Mr. HILL. The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] spoke about that situation at a time when the distinguished Senator from Arkansas was not able to be on the floor. If I do not quote the Senator from Oregon correctly, I would be delighted to have him make the statement in his own way; but, as I understood the distinguished Senator from Oregon, the House conferees—6 members out of a total membership of 435—sat there in the conference and took the position that they would not report a disagreement and take the bill back to the House, and would not do anything unless the Senate conferees agreed to throw out the oil-for-education amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon. He sat in the conference. The Senator from Alabama was not a member of the conference. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. I am not attempting to justify the position of the House Members.

Mr. HILL. I appreciate that fact.

Mr. CORDON. I am merely reciting the position taken by them. The House Members took the position, first, that the matter was not before their committee, and, second, they had a record of a point of order having been raised previously to that type of legislation, and the order being sustained—that was the Mansfield case—and they were instructed to stand by the provision of the House with respect to the disposition of the funds.

Mr. HILL. Did they state who instructed them?

Mr. CORDON. They did not state, but from other sources, including some Members on the Senator's side of the aisle, the position they held was the position of the leaders of both parties in the House.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. That might be true; but we find ourselves in the situation that the Senate is now asked to sign articles of capitulation and surrender to six Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish it to be perfectly clear that this amendment was never voted on by the House of Representatives.

Mr. HILL. That is correct; the amendment never was voted on by the House.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The point of order made last year could not have any application to this bill, could it?

Mr. HILL. Not at all. As I tried to make clear, the amendment was offered in the House of Representatives by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], then a Member of the House. It was offered to the so-called tidelands bill, not to this bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have never heard of a case in which the conferees of either House simply refused to make a report. Do the conferees have a right to refuse to report to their House? If they wish to be arbitrary, can they simply refuse to report to their House, when there is disagreement among the conferees?

Mr. HILL. I suppose they can, if they can "get by with it"—as the conferees on the part of the House did in this case.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But, according to the practice, can one group of conferees simply refuse to report to their House, if there is no agreement between the conferees? Is that the practice?

Mr. HILL. The conferees have great power. I would not say that under the rules of the House or the Senate, it might not be possible to discharge the conferees. But I do not think that has occurred.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Has the Senator from Alabama ever heard of a similar case?

Mr. HILL. No; I do not think I have ever known of a time, during all my service in the Senate, when the Senate has discharged its conferees. However, that is the situation with which we are confronted; the conferees on the part of the House say, "Nothing doing. Sign up. Surrender, abandon, desert."

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Do I correctly understand that an amendment similar to the Hill amendment has never been adopted on the floor of the House of Representatives?

Mr. HILL. I would not say that. The Mansfield amendment was an amendment—

Mr. LEHMAN. I mean this year.

Mr. HILL. Not as an amendment in and of itself.

There was a provision in the Feighan substitute bill and also a provision in the Perkins substitute bill, but that

was only one provision among many others in those bills.

Mr. LEHMAN. But the amendment itself, as such has never been voted on by the House. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. There never has been a vote in the House of Representatives on the amendment, in and of itself.

Mr. LEHMAN. So that action on the part of the conferees representing the House was clearly arbitrary, was it?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, under the rules, we are not supposed to indulge in criticism of the other body.

Mr. LEHMAN. I withdraw the word "arbitrary."

Mr. HILL. But the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] has stated the situation. As he has stated, the conferees on the part of the House said, "We will have nothing to do with that amendment, and there will not be a conference report unless the Senate conferees surrender."

Mr. President, I do not like the word "surrender."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. In the conference, the conferees on the part of the House did not present a case against the oil-for-education amendment. There was no discussion at all. The House conferees merely expected the Senate to recede.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana was a member of the conference. As he has testified this afternoon, he attended every meeting of the conference. I wish to thank him for his service there.

Mr. President, I served for a number of years in the House of Representatives, and I am very proud of that membership. I would certainly reject any idea that the House of Representatives did not have the courage to vote on this amendment. In fact, a number of Members of the House of Representatives have said to me, "We are in favor of the amendment, and we would like to have an opportunity to vote on it."

Certainly, Mr. President, every one of the Members of the Senate met the issue. Not all Senators voted for the amendment; for reasons that were good and sufficient to them, some Senators did not see fit to vote for the amendment. But the Senate voted on the amendment. The Members of the Senate faced the question and met the issue presented by the amendment.

Why should not the House of Representatives speak on this issue? Why should not the House of Representatives vote on it?

Frankly, Mr. President, I do not know how the House would vote. But, regardless of whether the House voted the amendment up or voted the amendment down, at least in that case we would know how the House felt about the amendment, rather than be in our present situation, when we know only how six Members of the House happened to feel about it.

So, Mr. President, why should not the Senate insist that the conference report be returned for further conference?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It should.

Mr. HILL. Yes, certainly it should, as the Senator from Arkansas has said,

In that way we should let the Members of the House of Representatives, as the chosen representatives of the people, face this matter squarely and cast their votes on the amendment.

That is the only fair and reasonable thing to do, consistent with the dignity, stature, and position of the Senate of the United States. Surely we still believe in the Constitution, and surely we still believe that the House and the Senate are equal bodies, and should continue as such. But how long can that equality last if the Senate is to surrender to 6 Members of the House of Representatives—6 out of a total membership of 435.

Mr. President, the Members of the Senate have faced this issue. This measure presents the immediate and the challenging and the golden opportunity to dedicate these revenues to education, to let the American people know now that we mean to do something about the crisis in American education, and that we have acted to do something about that crisis—not that we have postponed and put off and thereby perhaps weakened and even endangered the future possibility of this dedication.

What shall we tell a teacher in a remote area, who is teaching in a one-room schoolhouse? Shall we say we would not stand up and fight, so that the teachers of the United States may have more adequate compensation? Are we going to say that? Many of the teachers today are living on a mere pittance. The teachers are inadequately paid. Today the teachers of America constitute the lowest paid group in the United States. Yet are we going to say to them, "Well, we just surrendered; we just gave up. We deserted your cause."

What are we going to say to the parents of all the boys and girls, the fine young children who attend classes in the schoolhouses of this land? Those boys and girls cannot speak for themselves. To use the words of Daniel Webster:

Though they cannot speak for themselves, there are those who love them.

What are we to say to the fathers and mothers of these children? They know the conditions under which their children go to school. They know the dilapidated condition of the American school system, the crowded condition of the classrooms, and the inadequacy of the school buildings. They know that the education of their children is being virtually cut in half because of the dilapidated condition of the classrooms and school buildings. They know that more than a million American children are forced to go to school half-time, because of double shifts in schools, and they know that some schools even have three shifts a day. They know that the education of millions of American children is suffering because of the fact that the teachers are paid so little. The teachers have been given such small reward for the work they do, that literally thousands of them have been forced to leave the teaching profession, and to take jobs in industry—in defense plants and in other avenues of business. The result of that shift is that in many cases the replacement teachers are inadequately trained and inadequately prepared.

Mr. President, just as water cannot rise higher than its source, so a class of schoolchildren cannot be better than its teacher. Let us remember that if we do not fill each golden minute "with 60 seconds' worth of distance run," we can never reclaim those seconds. If a child's education is impaired today, if the child is taught by a poorly trained, inadequate teacher, that child never can go back and reclaim the lost time. It is gone, and gone forever.

So, Mr. President, what are we to say to the parents of these boys and girls, these fine young lads and lasses of America, who are to be the citizens of tomorrow? If we do not stand up for them, if we say, "We took our stand, but because 6 Members of 435 Members of the House of Representatives said, 'You have to surrender,' we proceeded to surrender," what will the parents of the schoolchildren of America say?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am very glad the Senator is making such a strong fight to get the Senate to reject the conference report. I need not say to the Senator, who served, as have several of us, in the House of Representatives for a number of years, that the majority of Senators are in favor, through the use of this fund, of doing something for the schools of the Nation. Does the Senator not feel that the majority of the Members of the House of Representatives would also be eager to assist the educational institutions of the country, if they but had an opportunity to vote on the amendment?

Mr. HILL. I may say to my friend, as I said a little earlier, a number of Members of the House of Representatives have voluntarily said to me, "We are for your amendment; we would like to vote for the amendment; we want an opportunity to vote on the amendment." I think the Senator from Tennessee is absolutely correct. The Senator served in the House, just as I had the great honor of serving in the House, and he knows, I am sure, that the Members of the House, as well as the Members of the Senate, are willing to meet their responsibility, are willing to discharge their duties, to face the issues, and that they would be glad to vote on the amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does the Senator feel that, in order that they may have an opportunity to express themselves, we ought to stand unitedly for the rejection of the conference report, in order to enable Members of the House to have an opportunity to vote on the amendment?

Mr. HILL. That is exactly what I am urging the Senate to do.

Mr. President, what are we to say to the teachers and parents back home? What are we to say to the great educational organizations, such as the National Education Association, the American Council on Education, the American Federation of Teachers—which has been fighting for this amendment for so long—the American Vocational Education Association, the American Library Association, the National Grange, the National Farmers Union, the Cooperative League of the U. S. A., the American

Federation of Labor, the CIO, many other great organizations? Mr. President, if there is no objection, I wish to place this list in the RECORD, a list of those who have been fighting for this amendment for over 2 years. They have poured out their hearts, their efforts, and their labor in support of this amendment, seeking to do something for our schools and for our schoolchildren.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE ORGANIZATIONS HAVE ENDORSED THE HILL OIL-FOR-EDUCATION AMENDMENT

National Education Association; the American Council on Education; the American Federation of Teachers; the American Library Association; the American Vocational Association, Inc.; the National Grange; National Farmers Union; the Co-op League of the United States of America; the American Federation of Labor; the Congress of Industrial Organizations; the Railway Labor Executives Association; the Oil Workers International Union; the Communications Workers of America; the Textile Workers Union of America; the United Mine Workers; the United Automobile Workers; the Friends Committee on National Legislation; Americans for Democratic Action; Students for Democratic Action; the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees; Switchmen's Union of North America; the Order of Railroad Telegraphers; Brotherhood of Railway Clerks; American Train Dispatchers' Association; International Association of Machinists; International Brotherhood of Boilermakers; International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths; Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America; Sheet Metal Workers' International Association; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America; Railroad Yardmasters of America; Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters; Hotel and Restaurant Employees' and Bartenders' International Union; National Organization Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America; National Marine Engineers' Association; International Longshoremen's Association; the Order of Railway Conductors; the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers; the United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers; the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; the Mayors' Committee for Offshore Oil; and the NEA Department of Classroom Teachers.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HOEY. I wonder what the Senator thinks about the matter of public education. I have received probably a hundred telegrams from my State, and perhaps 200 letters, complaining because the word "public" is not used before the word "education." What does the Senator from Alabama have to say about that?

Mr. HILL. All in the world that is proposed under this amendment is that Congress make the funds available for purposes of primary, secondary, and higher education. It was made very clear at the time the amendment was agreed to that Congress would have to enact future legislation providing for distribution of the funds before any of the funds could be used. The only issue involved in the amendment is the issue of whether the funds shall be used for education or whether the funds will go for some other purpose.

Mr. HOEY. Does the Senator feel that there is no possibility, under the present conference report of changing that provision in any way?

Mr. HILL. I do. I may say to the Senator that, once the conference report is voted down, and the bill sent back to conference, it will then be in the hands of the conferees. The provision would be in conference and under the rules of the Senate and the House subject to change or amendment by the conferees.

Mr. HOEY. Does the Senator mean that the conferees could submit another report, with the word "public" included in the provision?

Mr. HILL. The committee on conference would have the power to do that or make other changes.

Mr. President, I realize that we should vote, and I do not want to take further time of the Senate. I sought when the amendment was before the Senate, to emphasize the necessity of providing better training and better education for our young people, in order to meet the compelling needs of national security. I cited reports by many distinguished commissions and councils, reports which have been issued within the past 2 or 3 months, and which declare emphatically that our national defense is today suffering, and is today threatened as a result of our failure to build our human resources; that is, to properly train, prepare, and educate our children.

I gave as an illustration the testimony of Dr. Waterman, head of the National Science Foundation, who, a few weeks ago, in testifying before the House Appropriations Committee, called attention to the fact that by 1955 Russia will be graduating 50,000 engineers a year, while we will be graduating only 17,000. I read the report of the Engineers Joint Council, in which it is stated that we are, even today, being delayed in getting defense production and in carrying out defense contracts, by reason of the shortages of engineers, scientists, physicists, and chemists. The council did not stop there. It emphasized the shortage of doctors, nurses, and skilled specialists of all kinds. I may say that two of the commissions that made the reports were appointed by President Eisenhower when he was president of Columbia University.

Mr. President, unless we reject the conference report, we reject that which has been called the opportunity for an act of statesmanship equivalent to what was done in 1785, 1787, 1862, and in other great landmarks in the leadership of the Federal Government in developing education in this country. We recall the words of Daniel Webster, spoken of the ordinance of 1787 which set aside every 16th section of the public lands west of the Appalachian Mountains for the establishment and maintenance of schools. Webster declared.

I doubt whether one single law of any lawgiver, ancient or modern, has produced effects of more distinct, marked, and lasting character than the ordinance of 1786 * * * it set forth and declared it to be a high and binding duty of the Government to support schools and advance the means of education.

Throughout the entire life of our country, Congress has been faithful to this duty as declared by our Founding

Fathers and has passed some 160 acts providing for public-land revenues or general revenues for education. But if we adopt this conference report today we have witnessed an abrogation of this duty.

Mr. President, our Nation has grown great, rich and powerful, achieved the highest level of civilization, productive genius and standard of living in the history of man, not just because we were a broad expanse of fertile earth with verdant forests, deep rivers, and rich natural resources, but because our forefathers had the vision and the wisdom to use our natural wealth given by a bountiful Creator to provide an educational system that gave to our people the highest general level of intelligence and gave to our people the finest agricultural, industrial, professional, and scientific education and training on this earth.

Every one of the 159 million Americans owes a great debt to this heritage of education which our forefathers provided through the great land grants.

All we seek by this amendment is to carry forward that great policy.

Mr. President, I speak of this amendment as the oil-for-education amendment. Some persons have spoken of it as the Hill amendment. I want to say that the amendment has 35 sponsors.

We sat here a little earlier this afternoon and were moved by the beautiful and richly deserved tributes paid to our great former colleague, the Senator from New Hampshire, Charles Tobey. This amendment had no more devoted advocate than Charles Tobey. I should like to think that this amendment will stand through the years as a testimonial to the vision and the faith of Charles Tobey. He was one of the original 11 sponsors of this amendment. In season and out of season he fought the battle for the amendment.

Mr. President, I know Senators wish to vote. I shall not delay them longer, except to say: Let us stand fast. Let the Senate be true to the stature, the position, the dignity, and the equal rights of the Senate in our legislative processes. Let the Senate be true to the teachers all over the land. Let the Senate keep faith with our school children and with the mothers and fathers of those children, and keep faith with our country, and insist that the House at least take a vote on this amendment, a vote which we know has never been taken. Let us stand today for our children and for our country and insist that the House speak on this amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I desire to confirm everything the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has said this afternoon in his effort to have the Senate reject this conference report. I rise to oppose acceptance by the Senate of the conference report on the Continental Shelf bill. I refused to sign the conference report because I thought it was absolutely wrong for 6 Members of the House to feel that they should ask the Senate conferees to recede from this amendment when it had been agreed to by the Senate with a very substantial majority voting in favor of it.

The very first of the reasons why I feel the House of Representatives should not

take this attitude is that they themselves, as pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Alabama, have never voted on the question. It seems to me they should exercise the same democratic principles in the House that we exercise in the Senate. The House conferees should have taken the issue to the House for a vote before expecting the Senate conferees to recede.

Even if I did not feel so strongly on this matter, I would favor this body rejecting the conference report and insisting that not six Representatives in conference, but the entire House of Representatives, act on this important matter before serious consideration is given to receding, if that proves necessary.

It is my opinion that if we stand firm on this matter the question will be submitted to the House floor and the Hill amendment will be adopted.

Mr. President, I do not desire to discuss the merits of the Hill amendment at great length at this time. There has been an extended discussion of it in times past during this session. My views were expressed in Report No. 133, part 2, the minority report on Senate Joint Resolution 13.

Part 4 of that document is a thorough discussion of the educational crisis in the United States, of the need for buildings, higher teachers pay and more teachers, and of the need for more chemists, more engineers, and many more technicians to assure our national security.

The senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] a month ago called attention to the fact that Soviet Russia is now producing more trained technicians, more scientists, than the United States. Yet the condition of our schools, which should be improving to meet this situation, is growing worse instead.

A large percentage of our colleges are operating in the red, although tuitions are so high that they are making higher education unavailable to many of our youth.

The possibility of meeting the educational emergency out of appropriated funds has never been so little. The United States has necessarily shouldered large commitments abroad. We are making large defense expenditures which have been reduced—some of us believe, at least—further than they should have been reduced for national security, in our efforts to balance the budget.

Despite our efforts to balance the budget at this session of the Congress, we have ended fiscal 1953 with a \$9 billion deficit and the Senator from Virginia foresees another deficit next year of \$10 billion if we retain all present taxes or \$14 billion if taxes scheduled to expire January 1 are not reenacted.

Consequently there seems little possibility that adequate sums, can be obtained from tax revenues and normal sources adequately to meet educational needs.

The setting aside of revenues from land and natural resources is no new policy in this Nation. It has been done since before the Constitution was adopted, in 1780, when the Continental Congress dedicated the public lands in

the West to education. There have been 160 such measures since.

Mr. President, I declined to sign this conference report, because I do not feel that it is proper for the Senate to supinely bow to the will of anything less than the full membership of the House of Representatives on so vital an issue. It then seemed to me inconceivable—as it does now—that the Senate would fail to insist on the Hill amendment being voted upon by the full House.

I repeat, that while the House conferees have arbitrarily refused without reason to submit the matter to a vote of the full House up to this time, I am convinced that upon the insistence of the Senate they will see the justice of our position and will take the matter to the House.

The program envisaged by the Hill amendment is backed by the people of this country and is absolutely necessary for the stabilization of our American educational system.

I therefore strongly oppose Senate acceptance of the conference report.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I desire to speak very briefly on this subject. To me, the action of the House conferees comes as a shock and disappointment. The bill was passed by the Senate by a vote of 45 to 37, showing the sentiment in the Senate regarding this very wise and very necessary measure. Now, merely because six conferees of the House, meeting with our conferees, refused to consider the Hill amendment, we are deprived of any possibility of enjoying the benefits of the amendment this year.

Mr. President, in this country we lack teachers; we lack schoolhouses, and our teachers are grossly underpaid. It was demonstrated on the floor of the Senate by authoritative sources that the average teacher, even in States which are reasonably prosperous, receives less than do vermin exterminators, attendants in restrooms, garbage collectors, and the most unskilled forms of common labor. Despite the fact that one cannot become a teacher with adequate training without going through years of training and experience, still teachers receive completely inadequate compensation.

But the main difficulty and main risk in what is being done today lies in the fact that during the past year the school population of this country increased 1 million over last year's enrollment. One million more children entered the public schools of this country than entered a year ago. The best estimates that can be obtained, and I know they come from reliable sources, is that the school population of the United States will increase by 1 million a year for the next 5, 6, or 7 years. What will we do with those children? Shall we simply say, "We cannot give you an education, despite the fact that we have boasted that education is the greatest asset this country has or possibly could have?"

We know there is a tremendous shortage of engineers, doctors, nurses, and dentists, and of trained persons in various other professions. We know, too, that today a well-educated farmer is a far better farmer than an uneducated

one. We know he is able to use all the scientific methods that are taught in agricultural schools and extension courses, which could not be made available to him unless there were sufficient funds.

We know that in every walk of life education plays a tremendous role, and prepares people for a better life and to be a far greater asset in the national economy than if they remain uneducated.

I strongly concur in the recommendation and plea that the Senate disagree to the report and return it to the House. If that is done, I think consideration must be given to the fact that the Hill amendment was agreed to in the Senate by a vote of 45 to 37, far more than a majority, and that we shall have the conference report come back to us, containing this very wise and necessary amendment.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, when the Senate has completed its consideration of the conference report on the outer Continental Shelf bill, it is proposed to have a call of the calendar of bills to which there is no objection, from the point where we last left off, not from the beginning of the calendar. We would start on page 9 of today's calendar with Order No. 647, and go through to the end of the printed calendar of today.

I understand there were 2 or 3 bills which by agreement on the last call of the calendar, were to be taken up today.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Three bills were carried over by unanimous consent. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). They are Calendar No. 617, Senate bill 2038; Calendar No. 620, Senate bill 2231; and Calendar No. 645, H. R. 4483.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Calendar Nos. 617, 620, and 645. The other day, when we thought we might have a calendar call yesterday, which we did not have, I announced we would stop the call of the calendar at the end of that day's calendar, because with reference to the bills which had been reported subsequently the bills and reports themselves would not be ready.

I have been informed by the clerks at the desk that the bills and reports are now available to the end of today's calendar. However, if by chance the minority calendar committee, because they thought we would stop at an earlier point, believes that it would be inconvenient to go that far, because it did not have an opportunity to study the bills, I would have no objection to stopping at a point not that far on the calendar. I would suggest that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] inform me later in the day with respect to that point.

REQUEST FOR IMMEDIATE PASSAGE OF BYRNES-WILEY AMENDMENT FOR WISCONSIN RETIREMENT FUND

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at this morning's session of the Senate Finance

Committee, favorable action was taken on H. R. 2062, introduced by the Honorable JOHN BYRNES, of Wisconsin. This is a companion bill to the Wiley bill, S. 1164.

This legislation is designed to authorize an agreement to integrate the Wisconsin retirement fund with the Federal social-security system.

It affects only the State of Wisconsin, the one State in the Union which made advance provision in its statutes for such integration—the State which completely dovetailed its system so as to provide smoothly for eventual supplementary coverage.

This bill, which is humanitarian, sound, and equitable has achieved about as unanimous support as any legislation with which I am familiar in this session of the Congress.

It will end the present curious situation which exists as follows:

Thirty thousand workers are now covered under the Wisconsin retirement fund.

But they are not permitted to have supplementary Federal coverage. Why? Merely because the State of Wisconsin had the foresight to set up the State fund and incidentally to provide for eventual integration, years and years ago.

On the other hand, there are some 10,000 workers now employed in counties and local governments who are covered under social security, merely because they were not under the Wisconsin retirement fund prior to the date specified in the most recent omnibus social-security law.

This present curious situation will be corrected by passage of the bill.

The bill would have been passed years ago but for the fact that the sheer mass of amendments on other social-security phases served to prevent it.

BILL SHOULD BE PASSED TODAY

Every passing day involves great hardships, especially on two particular counts:

First. If a worker retires today and is in the Federally excluded groups, that is, is covered only under the Wisconsin retirement fund, he will per se obviously not receive supplementary Federal coverage.

But, practically the minute this law goes into effect that same worker will be in a position to receive supplementary Federal coverage.

This will naturally increase and make more liveable his modest pension.

Naturally, therefore, a considerable number of workers are holding on to their jobs although they long since might have retired because of age, health, or some similar factor.

Every passing day, therefore, involves difficulties to these workers and difficulties to the State, counties, and local governments which otherwise would permit their retirement.

Second. A second basic reason for immediate passage is this:

The retirement fund is losing considerable money in that funds are being held in liquid form at a considerable loss of interest which otherwise could be obtained from more profitable investment of the money.

Every single day, therefore, involves loss of interest.

And, so in view of these unusual conditions, I shall ask tomorrow unanimous consent that the bill be brought up for consideration at the present time and passed.

I ask unanimous consent that a supplementary statement which I have prepared on this subject be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks and that it be followed by (a) the text of a fine wire sent to me by Mr. Arnold Zander, international president of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees on behalf of himself and Mr. Frederick McMillan, director of the Wisconsin retirement fund, together (b) with certain additional messages from the grassroots of Wisconsin.

There being no objection, the statement and telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The proposal for final legislative action now brings to a successful climax efforts which I have made for several years here in the Senate and which the Honorable JOHN BYRNES of Wisconsin as made in the House of Representatives.

On Tuesday, July 28, Congressman DAN REED, Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee secured the passage of H. R. 2062.

Immediately thereafter, I called to the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Mr. MILLIKIN, and the able ranking minority member, Mr. GEORGE, the fact that on June 27, 1952, when the social-security issue was up before the Senate, Senator GEORGE had agreed to the passage of this legislation.

At that time, on the floor, my able colleague from Georgia pointed out that a vast number of amendments had been offered in the Senate and that it was impossible to attempt to deal with all of them on that particular occasion.

However, he stated:

"As to the question which troubles the Senator from Wisconsin, the committee would have no objection to the Wisconsin system coming in because prior to the passage of the Social Security Act, the Wisconsin law contemplated and anticipated the setting up of an Old Age and Survivors' Insurance System. That can be cared for in January."

Later on, Senator GEORGE stated to me:

"I can say to the Senator that the committee will not offer any objection to permitting the State of Wisconsin to bring its system under the Federal system because that has been anticipated."

At that time, I expressed my appreciation to Senator GEORGE for his fine assurance.

As we are all aware, this year, the House Ways and Means Committee decided, that there could not be final action on comprehensive revision of the social-security laws in 1953.

Instead, it turned over a final decision on this issue until 1954 when it will have completed a study of broad-scale changes in the Old Age and Survivors' Insurance System.

It is most imperative, however, that the Wisconsin amendment be passed now. The well-being of some 30,000 individuals belonging to the State retirement fund is at stake.

These individuals will receive on the average, rather inadequate pensions. Inflation has robbed the purchasing power of these pensions. These faithful State, county, and local workers are entitled to elementary justice. They will hardly be able to keep body and soul together under present pension levels.

They are entitled to complete coverage under the Federal system, just as a worker in a private factory plan is entitled to supplementary coverage.

Surely the one State of the Union which had the foresight to plan for such coverage shall not be penalized and its citizens left out in the cold.

Let their patience—their hoping—their praying, now be justly rewarded.

I feel sure that next year the Congress will wisely act to broaden the coverage under the Social Security System and to bring additional millions within its scope.

Here, however, is one group in one State of the Union in whose behalf we can take action today, immediately.

The bill does not in any way affect any other State of the Union. It does not affect those teachers and firemen who have indicated preference to have their systems kept intact and separate.

The bill will hurt no one. It will help a great many people. Its passage will fulfill promises made on both sides of Capitol Hill.

MADISON, WIS., July 29, 1953.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator from Wisconsin;
Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

From the time that the law creating the Wisconsin retirement fund was originally enacted by the 1943 legislature, provision has been contained therein for the integration of the State system with OASI. In 1951, and again in 1953, the Wisconsin Legislature clarified these integration provisions and today the State of Wisconsin stands ready to integrate immediately the Wisconsin retirement fund with OASI as soon as Congress eliminates the prohibition which was inserted in the Social Security Act after the Wisconsin law was originally enacted.

The approximately 30,000 State, county, and municipal employees under this retirement system are now eagerly awaiting action by Congress to make this integration possible.

In Wisconsin there is no controversy with respect to this proposal. The State Legislature, county boards, city councils, and the organizations representing the employees thereof are unanimously back of H. R. 2062. Policemen and firemen have been excluded from this enactment at their own request and the Wisconsin law so provides. Moreover the State of Wisconsin acting through the State of Wisconsin investment board has been accumulating the funds necessary to make this integration retroactive to January 1, 1951, so as to give these public employees full protection under the Social Security Act. It will be necessary to transfer approximately \$6 million from the State system to the Federal system covering both the employee and the employer contributions. These funds are being held in liquid form at a considerable loss of interest which could otherwise be obtained from the investment of these funds and it would be very unfortunate if this were delayed until 1954, thus prolonging the length of time during which these funds are held out from normal investment channels.

The average annuity now being paid under the Wisconsin retirement fund is only \$44.25 per month. It is therefore imperative that the integration provisions of the Wisconsin retirement fund be made effective as soon as possible as was originally contemplated when this retirement system was established by the Wisconsin Legislature.

F. N. MacMillin director of the Wisconsin retirement fund joins me in this message.

ARNOLD S. ZANDER,
International President, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees.

WEST MILWAUKEE, WIS., July 30, 1953.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

Your continued help in the passage of bill H. R. 2062 would be greatly appreciated.

E. M. STOKKE,

President, Village of West Milwaukee.

FOND DU LAC, WIS., July 30, 1953.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate:

Employees of the city of Fond Du Lac respectfully urge your support of immediate passage of H. R. 2062 for integration of Wisconsin retirement fund with Federal old-age and survivors insurance system which was passed by the House Tuesday, July 28.

EDWIN F. WEIS,

Mayor.

BELOIT, WIS., July 30, 1953.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,

Senate Office Building:

Beloit city employees join in asking that you do everything in your power to push H. R. 2062 through the United States Senate before adjournment.

R. H. CALLAND,

City Clerk, representing city employees.

BELOIT, WIS., July 30, 1953.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,

Senate Office Building:

All Wisconsin municipal employees urge you to use your influence in getting H. R. 2062 before Senate immediately. This bill passed by House Tuesday. See Congressman BYRNES, of Green Bay, for details. Your support will be appreciated.

A. D. TELFER,

City Manager, Beloit, Wis.

RACINE, WIS., July 30, 1953.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,

United States Senator from Wisconsin.

DEAR SENATOR: Sincerely solicit your wholehearted support for the passage of H. R. 2062.

GEORGE H. BENSON,

Personnel Director for the City of Racine.

FORT ATKINSON, WIS., July 29, 1953.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

All our employees would appreciate your active support on H. R. 2062.

E. F. KLEMENT,

City Manager.

WATERTOWN, WIS., July 29, 1953.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully urge your best effort toward the passage of H. R. 2062 before adjournment. Wisconsin workers in all branches of government are counting on your active support.

DEAN VAN NESS,

City Manager.

WAUPUN, WIS., July 30, 1953.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,

Senate Office Building:

We wish to thank and commend you for all the efforts you have made in our behalf relative to social security and again urge your every effort toward the passage of H. R. 2062.

ARTHUR H. ARPKE,

Secretary, Wisconsin State Prison
Local No. 18.

WAUSAU, WIS., July 30, 1953.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,

Senate Office Building:

We humbly urge your support to secure favorable action on bill H. R. 2062.

EVERETT GLEASON,

Chief of Police.

WAUSAU, WIS., July 30, 1953.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Vitally interested in securing early passage of H. R. 2062. Your efforts will be greatly appreciated.

W. G. PETZOLD,

Chief, Wausau Fire Department.

JANESVILLE, WIS., July 30, 1953.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,

United States Senate:

Your prompt, wholehearted efforts to secure fast, immediate action in Senate on H. R. 2062 which will permit thousands of Wisconsin municipal workers to have social security earnestly and urgently solicited. This measure will benefit local taxpayers as it will make early retirement possible for many city employees who because of age are ineligible for livable pensions under State system alone and who are consequently being continued on local payrolls beyond their productive years.

WARREN C. HYDE,

City Manager.

BARRON, WIS., July 30, 1953.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,

Senate Chamber,

Washington, D. C.:

Regarding bill H. R. 2062, we, the employees of the Barron County Highway Department, wish you to fight as strongly as possible for the passage of this bill before the Senate adjourns this session. We feel you will do everything in your power for us regarding this bill.

Thank you.

BARRON COUNTY HIGHWAY EMPLOYEES.

WISCONSIN RAPIDS, WIS., July 30, 1953.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,

Senate Chamber,

Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to use your best effort to secure passage of bill H. R. 2062, which is now before the Senate.

CITY OF WISCONSIN RAPIDS,

C. C. KNUDSEN, Mayor.

NELS M. JUSTESON, City Clerk.

EAU CLAIRE, WIS., July 30, 1953.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,

United States Senator:

You are urged to fight vigorously for the immediate passage in the Senate of H. R. 2062 which passed the House of Representatives on Tuesday. Thirty-six of our employees who are 65 years of age or older will be particularly grateful to you for getting this bill enacted into law. The time for positive and aggressive action has arrived. Your cooperation will be deeply appreciated.

DAVID ROWLAND,

City Manager, City of Eau Claire.

MANITOWOC, WIS., July 30, 1953.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

Request your aid in doing everything possible to procure immediate favorable action in Senate on H. R. 2062. Your continued efforts for integration of the Wisconsin retirement fund with the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system are sincerely appreciated.

RUDOLPH E. MENCHIL,

Mayor.

SUPERIOR, WIS., July 30, 1953.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

I have just been informed that the House has passed H. R. 2062 calling for integration of Wisconsin retirement fund with Federal insurance system. This bill is of extreme importance to the thousands of public employees in Wisconsin and we have fought for

this for many years. Now that possible passage of this is in sight will you please use your influence in the Senate to get this across for us before your body adjourns. At present public employees are discriminated against in matters of this kind unless this bill is passed.

R. E. BAUMBERGER,

City Manager.

SUPERIOR, WIS., July 30, 1953.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Local 235, Superior, Wis., city hall municipal employees, sincerely request your backing of H. R. 2062 calling for integration of the Wisconsin retirement fund with Federal insurance system. Passage of this bill by your honorable body is of great importance to all public employees in the State of Wisconsin.

THOMAS THOMPSON,

President, Local 235, City Hall Employees

MADISON, WIS., July 29, 1953.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

H. R. 2062, relating to social security for Wisconsin State employees, passed House. Please work for passage in Senate.

Dr. W. J. URBEN,

Superintendent, Mendota State Hospital.

MADISON, WIS., July 29, 1953.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,

United States Senator,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

We strongly urge you to do everything in your power to get H. R. 2062 passed by the Senate before adjournment.

THE 1,000 MEMBERS OF UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN EMPLOYEES, LOCAL 171.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., July 29, 1953.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

The members of Local 82, Wisconsin State College, have requested me individually and collectively to ask that you give your utmost effort to secure the passage of bill H. R. 2062 to secure for Wisconsin civil-service employees the benefits of social security. We all urgently request that you give all possible effort to have this measure acted upon before adjournment. We feel this is of vital importance to us and ask that as our Representative in the Senate you give us all help possible.

INEZ K. WEAVER,

Secretary, Local 82, WSEA, Wisconsin State College.

KENOSHA, WIS., July 30, 1953.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Wisconsin municipal employees will be first in the Nation to enjoy social-security benefits if you can secure passage of H. R. 2062 in the Senate. We urge your immediate action.

CONRAD J. SHEARER,

President, Kenosha City Council.

SHEBOYGAN, WIS., July 30, 1953.

Senator ALEXANDER M. WILEY,
United States Senate:

Congratulations on your good work. Urge passage of H. R. 2062 integration of Wisconsin retirement fund with social security.

Sincerely,

A. A. DAMBOW,

County Board Chairman.

E. L. KAUFMANN,

County Clerk.

TOMAHAWK, WIS., July 30, 1953.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Two hundred and forty members, Local 303, Wisconsin Forest Protection Employees, Wisconsin State Employees Association, urgently request full attention and effort toward passage of bill H. R. 2062 before Congress adjourns Saturday.

V. A. MOON,
Mercer, President.
GEORGE CHIDO,
Spooner, Vice President.
HARRY KOZELL,
Mercer, Vice President.
ANTON ROLLO,
Wausaukee, Vice President.
EINER JENSEN,
Friendship, Vice President.
ALFRED BRACKEN,
Tomahawk, Vice President.
STAURT MCCOY,
Tomahawk, Secretary.
ERNEST AMUNDSEN,
Tomahawk, Treasurer.

NEENAH, WIS., July 30, 1953.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge your wholehearted support of bill H. R. 2062 permitting integration of Wisconsin retirement fund with Federal old-age and survivors insurance system. Advised that bill has passed House and urge your utmost effort to have bill concurred in by Senate before adjournment.

CARL E. LOEHING,
Mayor, City of Neenah, Wis.

MARSHFIELD, WIS., July 30, 1953.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to do whatever you can to get immediate action on H. R. 2062 to permit our city employees to gain the benefits of Federal old age and survivors insurance.

JAMES J. BURKE,
Mayor.

MENASHA, WIS., July 30, 1953.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

This association urges your support of bill H. R. 2062 and assistance to have it enacted during the present session of Congress.

JOHN B. JEWABNY,
Secretary, Wisconsin Municipal
Utilities Association.

LA CROSSE, WIS., July 30, 1953.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator:

Petition filed with me signed by 270 La Crosse County employees and members of the county board of supervisors urging your support of H. R. 2062. May I also extend my appreciation for your support of this bill.

ESTHERM DOMKE,
County Clerk.

OSHKOSH, WIS., July 30, 1953.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate:

Our organization constituted of well over 100 members unanimously requests that you use every conceivable effort to secure passage of bill H. R. 2062 passed by House of Representatives last Tuesday. This should be a must legislation before the adjournment.

OSHKOSH CITY EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were com-

municated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations and withdrawing a nomination, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6200) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TABER, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, Mr. CANON, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. GARY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5976) to amend section 1 of the Natural Gas Act, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5976) to amend section 1 of the Natural Gas Act, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REORGANIZATION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am glad to observe on the floor while I am making these comments the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. The controversy that has been going on downtown in connection with the position the District Commissioners are finally to take in connection with the so-called Lowe-Fowler jurisdictional issue causes me to make these additional comments tonight.

In the first place, when the provision of the Senate Appropriations Committee in regard to the matter was eliminated from the bill on a point of order, that was Senate action. It was Senate action under the rules of the Senate. It was a finding by the Senate, until reversed by the Senate under its rules, that it was legislation on an appropriation bill, and called for a suspension of the rule. In the absence of a suspension of the rule and the overriding of the point of order thereby, in my judgment, the Senate conferees were bound by the rule. They were bound by the action taken by the Senate through its presiding officer.

The matter originated in the Senate, not in the House. Therefore, in my opinion, it was wrong for the Senate con-

ferees to raise the issue in any form, shape, or manner in the conference. The Senate having decided, through its rules, that the proposal in the appropriations bill was out of order under the rule, and the House never having raised the issue in the House appropriation bill, I think it was quite wrong on the part of the Senate conferees to raise the question anew in the conference report by way of expressing an opinion, which they knew very well had no legal, binding effect whatsoever on anyone, and which, at best, could be interpreted, as it has been interpreted in the press, as a recommendation.

The second point I wish to make is that after the amendment was thrown out in the Senate on a point of order under a Senate rule, Mr. Spencer, a District Commissioner, called me on the telephone and thanked me for the position I took on the floor of the Senate. He told me I was absolutely right, from the standpoint of the policy issue involved. He said he thought it would be very unfortunate if the amendment in the appropriation bill had been agreed to, for it would have interfered with the plan which had been adopted under Reorganization Plan No. 5. He agreed that if the plan were to be changed, it should be changed by the legislative route, before the Committee on the District of Columbia.

I make this statement for the RECORD, because I understand there are some who seem to think Mr. Spencer may be of two minds in the matter: of one mind when he talks to one Senator, and of another mind when he talks to another Senator. Be that as it may, I take the position again this afternoon that after the amendment was removed from the Senate Appropriations bill on a point of order, it should not, even in the form of a recommendation, have been put back in any conference report, but we should have waited until it could have been acted upon in the usual legislative channels.

I make this statement today for the benefit of the Commissioners, because I recognize, as I said last Saturday, and have said from the beginning, that the Commissioners have power to reorganize these two offices, if they wish to, under Reorganization Plan No. 5. But they led us to believe last Saturday, when they first protested the language in the appropriation bill, that they did not want plan No. 5 interfered with in any way as it had been put into operation. I raised the point of order; and after I raised the point of order Mr. Spencer himself called me, thanked me, and agreed completely with the position I took on the matter.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Several things might be said; but the Senate should understand that what the Senator from Oregon objected to on the point of order was something that was apart and distinct from what was recommended by the conferees on the appropriation bill. The fact is that the total power of reorganization was placed in the hands of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia by the

reorganization plan. There was never any legislation by the Congress which consolidated the Office of the Budget Officer with that of the reorganizer.

The Senator from South Dakota originally raised the question of reorganization of the District of Columbia. It grew out of the fact that a considerable portion of the original so-called Taft-Kaufman home-rule bill was devoted to a detailed reorganization of the District of Columbia. The Senator from South Dakota, when he was assigned to the District Committee, after examining the bill came to the conclusion that there was entirely too much detail of reorganization in it for it to be considered by the Senate or by the House of Representatives. He felt that it would not receive adequate consideration, and so proposed that that feature be dropped from the reorganization bill, and that reorganization itself be made a matter of home rule, the power to be given, so far as the Congress could give it, to the Commissioners, or to an elected local legislative body.

Subsequently Mr. Walter Fowler, who was the budget officer for the District of Columbia, made the observation to me that a very large part of the proposed reorganization—possibly 75 percent of it—could be accomplished administratively. I commented on that point on two or three occasions, and subsequently the President submitted a reorganization plan which placed in the hands of the Board of Commissioners the power of reorganization.

I recite that background to make it clear that the Senator from South Dakota was of the opinion that efficiency and economy could be accomplished by reorganization within the executive branch of the District of Columbia government. So when the President submitted a reorganization plan I welcomed it and felt that it was a step forward. I still feel that it was a step forward.

Let me state clearly for the Record that the Senator from South Dakota, either in his own capacity as a Member of the Senate or as chairman of the legislative committee for the District of Columbia, had nothing whatsoever to do with writing into the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia the provision which proposed to nullify the reorganization which placed the budget officer under the person in charge of reorganization, and which proposed, by the language in the appropriation bill to which the Senator from Oregon addressed his point of order, the consolidation of the office of the reorganizer and that of the budget officer under the District Commissioners.

The Senator from South Dakota was busy on some other matters and was unable to participate to any great extent in the hearings on the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia. However, I did attend a few of the hearings, and I attended the meeting at which we reviewed the bill which had been marked up. In that bill there was this language, and there was the committee report making the change to which the Senator from Oregon objected.

When the matter came to the floor and the Senator from Oregon did object, the Senator from South Dakota felt himself in honor bound, as a member

of the Appropriations Subcommittee ex-officio, representing the legislative committee, to support the action which was reported, although I again state for the record that I had nothing to do with writing that provision into the bill. I did not know it was going to be there.

I cite these facts for the consideration of the Senate. When the House passed its version of the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia it was not satisfied with the record made on reorganization. Evidence of that is that it withheld funds for a large number of the positions which had been proposed to be created by the reorganization officer for the District of Columbia.

I had nothing to do with the verdict on the part of the House committee. I did not participate in those hearings. I do not know on what evidence the House acted. However, the House came to the conclusion that too many new positions were being created in the reorganization of the District of Columbia, and it expressed itself by withholding funds for those new positions. I have not examined the record, but someone has told me that more than 60 new positions were being created in the reorganization, and that for those positions approximately 64 people had been brought into the District of Columbia government from outside Washington, in order to hold some of the new lush positions created by the district reorganizer. I have not examined the record. I do not know whether that was what persuaded the House or not. I have not conferred with House Members on that particular point. However, the fact is that the House did withhold money for many positions proposed to be created.

I did not participate in the hearings when the question of reorganization came up on the Senate side, in connection with the District of Columbia appropriation bill; but those who did, including the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the District of Columbia, did participate in those hearings. I heard him say that he had practically two sets of hearings. One set was on the record, and the other off the record, with representatives from some of the agencies talking to him about the demoralization of the District of Columbia government.

In any event, when the bill was marked up and presented to the Members for their consideration, this provision was in it. So I submit that the House Appropriations Subcommittee for the District of Columbia and the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee for the District of Columbia, in their official capacities, came to the conclusion that the reorganization plan, as it was then developed, was wrong, at least in the particular in which it placed the budget officer under the reorganizer.

I call the attention of Senators to the fact that in the Federal Government the Bureau of the Budget is not under the Secretary of the Treasury, nor is the Bureau of the Budget under the General Services Administration. The Bureau of the Budget and the Budget Director report directly to the President. They do not have to have a go-between to express themselves, or to make a statement

about the financial situation. They can go directly to the head of the executive agency, the President of the United States.

When the issue was raised by the point of order made by the Senator from Oregon I think he was wholly within his rights. If I had been in the Chair and using my own judgment, I would have taken the same position the Chair took on that occasion. I think that the inclusion of the language in the appropriation bill and the citation in the report were affirmative in their direction, and consequently constituted legislation, although at the time I felt in honor bound, having been a party to the report, to call attention to the fact that at least the first sentence in the report was in the nature of a recommendation. I believe that had the committee confined itself to making a recommendation in the report, which would not have been binding, but which would have been merely advisory, of course the point of order could not have arisen, because it would not have been directed to anything which actually appeared in the bill.

Be that as it may, when the bill went back to conference, the recommendation of the conferees was not identical with the proposal that was in the bill. That is the point I am getting to, but I felt it important that the background be given, because the Senator from Oregon, within his rights as a Member of the Senate and as a valued member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, has given this matter a great deal of attention. I have made no statement on this subject up to this time, but the Senator from Oregon has made a couple of statements in this connection; and since he was kind enough to direct his remarks to me on this issue this afternoon, I thought I should make this statement in order to make the issue clear.

The action which was taken by the conferees was a recommendation that the Budget Officer should be taken out from under the reorganization officer and put in an independent position, reporting directly to the Commissioners.

That was a different proposal than was proposed by the language in the appropriation bill. The language in the appropriation bill proposed to take the reorganization department, so to speak, and the budget office and combine the two of them and make them, under the Budget Officer, responsible to the District Commissioners.

The recommendation of the conferees was different. It did not disturb the reorganization office except to take the Budget Officer out and make him independent. It did not recommend placing the reorganization under the Budget Officer. It simply would create an independent officer as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who could report directly to the Commissioners, and not filter his opinion on the city's finances through the reorganization officer, who was brought here from the outside and who had grown up in the organization of a government which we sometimes refer to as the military, and who was familiar with military organization rather than with civilian organization.

I may state also for the RECORD and for the information of the Senator from Oregon that it is a matter which has concerned me a great deal because of the reports which have come to me about the demoralization of several officers, particularly in the Budget Office, and that the Budget Officer, who, I think, all agree who know Mr. Fowler, probably knows more about the city government and its details and about its finances and its possibilities and about the tax picture than any other individual in a factual way.

Reports were coming to us that he was in such a position that he was inclined to consider resigning, and thus the city of Washington would be deprived of his services. So the suggestion was made during the conference that we should not disturb Mr. Lowe, the reorganizer, but let him go ahead, except that we should reestablish the independence of the Budget Officer, or, at least, recommend it to the Commissioners.

I may say to the Senator from Oregon that I do not think the Senate has acted upon, nor has the House acted upon, the issue which he has raised by a point of order, and that the only action of a constituted body would be the action of the House Appropriations Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee, and that was the only place where the merits of the question were gone into before any deliberative portion of the Senate or the House.

The point of order did not raise the question on its merits. The issue was not presented to the floor of either House. It is a technical question, namely, Is it legislation on an appropriation bill? The only way in which the Senate or the House has considered the question on its merits has been through its Subcommittees on Appropriations. In both instances the two bodies, operating on different evidence, came to the conclusion that it would be poor business to have Mr. Fowler under Mr. Lowe, if we want to state it in personalities.

It was my own feeling that if we wanted to keep the services of Mr. Fowler as Budget Officer of the District of Columbia, it would be necessary that he be taken out from under the organizer and given an opportunity to report directly to the Commissioners. I did share in the recommendation of the conferees that we recommend it to the Commissioners.

A recommendation is not binding on the Commissioners, but I believe for the best interests of the District of Columbia that the recommendation should be seriously considered by the Commissioners.

I have been asked what Mr. Spencer said to me. I do not want to venture to speak for Mr. Spencer. He can speak for himself. I know what he has said, and it might be difficult for me personally to harmonize it entirely with what the Senator from Oregon has said was his expression of opinion to him.

In any event, I shall not try to quote Mr. Spencer. I feel that the District Commissioners should give careful consideration to the recommendation of the conferees. I do so because of the fact that the respective appropriations subcommittee recognized the fact that there

was a problem existing here. They attempted to deal with it, and they are the only ones who ever dealt with it or considered it on its merits. The Senate never considered the question on its merits. The only question before the Senate was the technical question of whether it was legislation on an appropriation bill. Whatever the merits of the question, they have never been passed upon by the Senate. The District Commissioners have authority under the Reorganization Act to reorganize the District in any way they see fit.

The reorganization plan takes all the major offices of the District of Columbia and dumps them into the lap of the Commissioners and says, "You have all the powers over the several officers of the District of Columbia, and you can reorganize and relocate them where you will."

It was the recommendation of the conferees that the Commissioners give consideration to making the Budget Officer independent so that he will report directly to them. I hope they will give serious consideration to the recommendation.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding to me. He was very generous in yielding to me. Since he had raised the issue I thought I should make a complete statement on the subject.

MR. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield, so that I may ask a question of the acting majority leader?

MR. MORSE. I yield, if it is agreed that I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MR. HUNT. As I understood the majority leader, the calendar call will begin with Calendar No. 647, House Concurrent Resolution 110, relating to permanent residence for certain aliens.

MR. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

MR. HUNT. Calendar No. 645, House bill 4483, providing compensation to the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes of Indians, has now been cleared, without objection on the part of any Senator. Would the Senator from California mind including that bill in the calendar of bills to be called today?

MR. KNOWLAND. It is one of the measures which I understood had been ordered placed at the foot of the calendar at a previous call of the calendar.

MR. HUNT. I thank the Senator from California and the Senator from Oregon.

MR. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall not take more than 4 or 5 minutes to refer both to the District of Columbia matter and to the unfinished business.

I was very happy to yield to the majority leader, because I wanted to be exceedingly fair to him and to make certain that he had full opportunity to reply to any comments and to make his own comments when the matter was under discussion. I also wish to cooperate at all times in having this issue raised where it should be raised, namely, in the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Furthermore, I am not in dispute with him as to the powers of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia un-

der Reorganization Plan No. 5 to be very free to carry out the functions to which he has referred. But if Congress has any plans for changing Reorganization Plan No. 5 or adopting a new reorganization plan for the District of Columbia, that subject should be handled in the legislative committee which has jurisdiction of the subject matter, and not in the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, that raises the point on which I find myself in disagreement with my distinguished chairman, namely, whether the action of the House conferees involved the identical point which was involved in the language of the appropriation bill which was thrown out on a point of order, under the Senate rule. I say it did, because in my judgment, those in the District of Columbia building knew that what was involved in the language of the appropriation bill and in the recommendation of the conferees was the question as to the group or individual or office to which Mr. Fowler would be immediately responsible—in short, whether he would be responsible to Mr. Lowe's office or to the Commissioners. That is what is involved in the amendment to the appropriation bill which was thrown out on a point of order. The effect was to take Mr. Fowler from under Mr. Lowe and direct that he make his reports to the Commissioners.

That is what the controversy was about; and, in effect, that is the recommendation of the conferees, when, in the conference report, they express their opinion about the course of action which Mr. Fowler should follow. I say that when we deal with that kind of interference with the reorganization powers of the District of Columbia Commissioners, in my judgment we should do so only after hearings and consideration of the matter as a substantive legislative matter before the Committee on the District of Columbia, not before the Appropriations Committee, which is not a legislative committee in the substantive sense.

Let me make an additional point which expresses some difference of opinion I have with my distinguished chairman, namely, that in the House bill there was no language showing that the House believed Mr. Fowler should be taken out from under Mr. Lowe.

A statement that the House made some changes in the appropriations and that in the hearings some disappointment was expressed about the way Reorganization Plan No. 5 was working out, does not establish in the bill a handle one can get hold of to justify the action of the conferees, on the basis of any action taken by the House of Representatives on the appropriation bill—which leaves us with the House sending the appropriation bill to the Senate, without having in the bill anything bearing on the proposed transfer of jurisdiction of Mr. Fowler's office away from Mr. Lowe, and directly under the Commissioners.

So we have the Senate language. That brings up the point as to what was the parliamentary effect of having that language thrown out as legislation on an appropriation bill.

I respectfully say that when the Presiding Officer of the Senate ruled that the point of order was well taken, in that the amendment was legislation on an appropriation bill, that was a ruling to which the Senate acceded by not sustaining an appeal, if one had been made, from the ruling of the Chair or in not agreeing to a motion to suspend the rule, if such a motion had been made. Of course, a two-thirds vote is required in order to carry such a motion. I point out, however, that no appeal was taken from the decision of the Chair, and no motion was made to suspend the rule.

Therefore, I say that when that bill went back to conference, there was no handle in it, either in the House language or in the Senate language, which in my judgment would justify the conferees in making any recommendation in regard to these two offices.

When they did it, in my judgment they acted beyond their power as conferees, as regards taking any action that would be to any extent whatever binding upon the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

If it is agreed that it is not binding upon the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, then what is the purpose of the recommendation? I am very kindly about it, Mr. President. The purpose of the recommendation is to serve notice on the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of what the Members of Congress who serve on this committee think about it. I do not care what it is called—a rose by any other name smells the same—but, in effect, it amounts to exerting political pressure upon the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Perhaps the proposed step should be taken; I do not know. It may very well be that after I heard the evidence, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I would join in a recommendation that Reorganization Plan No. 5 be changed. But I wish to hear the evidence before the committee which has legislative jurisdiction.

Therefore, I say I do not think it was right for the conferees to make this kind of recommendation, knowing very well that we have put the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in a rather tough spot—getting them in between one group which says, "You should do it" and another group which says, "Just a minute; wait until we consider Reorganization Plan No. 5, through the legislative process, in the committee which has jurisdiction over substantive legislation affecting the District of Columbia."

I agree with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] that probably it would be impossible to reconcile Mr. Spencer's conversation with the Senator from South Dakota with his conversation with the Senator from Oregon—thus proving my point about what happens when such situations develop, and when a conference committee, without any legislative mandate from the Senate, proceeds to make a recommendation which I believe is entirely beyond the

jurisdiction of the conferees, on the basis I have stated.

I do not know the facts about Mr. Fowler and Mr. Lowe. I have never met either of them. I have not been on the Committee on the District of Columbia long enough to have formed any judgment as to how Reorganization Plan No. 5 is working. But again I say that if the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are not competent and capable of carrying out the functions and purposes of Reorganization Plan No. 5 without interference from the Members of Congress, we had better get some new Commissioners. I do not think we ought to be setting a precedent whereby we weaken the development of home rule; rather, we ought to extend the development of home rule. We ought to say to the District Commissioners, "It is your job to run the city."

When they took the position which they took last Saturday, and when I was advised that they thought it would be very unwise to leave this language in the appropriation bill, I made a point of order for what purpose? I had various reasons for doing it. I did not like the whole procedure, for one thing. Secondly, I wanted to protect the rules of the Senate. But I also wanted to protect the jurisdiction of the District Commissioners. I did not think we ought to be giving them directions in an appropriation bill.

Mr. President, as to whether we might lose the services of Mr. Fowler, if he cannot have his way, I may say I have been in the position of an employer, and whenever I found a person who took the position that if he could not have his way, who would use the threat of resignation as a means of getting his way, I always handed him a blank piece of paper and suggested that, on that paper, he could write his resignation. I now suggest that to Mr. Fowler. If it is Mr. Fowler's position that he is going to quit if he cannot have his own way, then I would welcome his resignation. If, on the other hand, come this fall, or earlier, if the chairman of the committee wants to go into the question and hearings are held before the Committee on the District of Columbia, and it can be shown on the merits that this office ought to be modified in accordance with the recommendation of the conferees, I shall be found voting for it.

In the meantime, I say to the District Commissioners, I think they are going to put themselves in an impossible and indefensible situation if they take the position now that, although as recently as last Saturday they did not want this change, now, because they received this recommendation from some Members of Congress on the Hill, they are going to yield to the recommendation, they will cause a great loss of confidence in their ability, in my judgment, to administer the reorganization plan in accordance with what I assumed was their honest judgment last Saturday, when they took the public position they assumed regarding these two offices.

JURISDICTION OVER SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I turn to a very brief comment on the pending measure. In my judgment, the conference report should go back to conference, and if the Hill amendment cannot be reinstated in the bill, I think it better that we pass no legislation at all, because I assume that we shall probably be coming back before January 1. But if we should not return until then, that would be soon enough to take action on any Continental Shelf bill, if we cannot protect what I think are the great educational values and interests involved in the Hill amendment. But I have a suspicion, Mr. President—or shall I say a hunch, or shall I say I am willing to risk a guess?—that if the administration insists on taking some action between now and January 1 on the proposal to increase the debt ceiling, we shall probably be doing that along next October, in another session. I mean we shall be considering it; not doing it. We shall be considering it along next October, unless we reconvene for that purpose.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say October?

Mr. MORSE. I said I thought that if we were going to consider the debt ceiling, we would probably be doing it about next October.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I say we shall probably be. It is my guess, as I said, that we shall probably be recessing or adjourning to a time in the near future, to come back for the purpose of considering the debt-ceiling proposal, which is going to require extensive and prolonged hearings and debate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does not the Senator think most emphatically that the Senate should know where the money is to go, if there is to be an increased debt ceiling?

Mr. MORSE. That is merely one of the questions. There is a long list of them, a list as long as my arm, which I shall want to know about and shall want to have answered.

Mr. MAYBANK. But the Senator will agree, will he not, that that is one of the questions?

Mr. MORSE. Oh, a very important one; and I want to suggest today, Mr. President, as I said yesterday, that in round numbers there are approximately \$80 billions of unspent funds, and large amounts of money to lend, also unobligated. The President has the power to

impound those funds if it becomes necessary in order to prevent their expenditures, and in order to prevent exceeding the ceiling. That is ample protection, until we can get back to the Senate in October, if conditions turn out to be as fiscally dark as, apparently, Mr. Humphrey has been indicating today.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I make the suggestion that, if the situation requires either that we raise the debt ceiling or that we scale down certain appropriations already made, I am in favor of recalling the appropriations that we may take another look at them. It is better that we appropriate less than that we raise the debt ceiling because of the scary picture the press says Mr. Humphrey pointed out about what would happen by way of a panic if we did not have the money to cover obligations.

There is a corollary to that, too. If the debt ceiling is raised, with the economic situation of the country what it is at this hour, it will again open the floodgates of inflation, and the result will be a panic of a different economic sort.

I think we are right up against the gun. This is the time to hold and hold, and hold, economically speaking. It is the time to say, "No more debt; we will recall these appropriations; we will take another look at them and scale them down, if necessary, in order to prevent the raising of the debt ceiling." I believe that would be one of the best lessons we could teach the world as to democratic processes, and what self-government means when it comes to protecting the economic stability and soundness of our country.

So, Mr. President, I say that, with that issue still ahead, we have plenty of time to consider the Continental Shelf bill, either in October or next January—and better that we not pass it at all than that we eliminate the Hill amendment.

I have discussed this subject so many times in the speeches I have made that it would certainly be repetitious if I were to dwell on it at any length, but by way of argument, all I want to do is to insert in the RECORD a letter which I wrote to the editor of a newspaper in the State of Oregon who differed with me in regard to the Hill amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In your editorial of July 3, entitled "Oil for Education" you minimize the importance of the Hill oil-for-education amendment to the outer Continental Shelf bill, both of which passed the Senate recently.

The oil-for-education amendment is not a "pious gesture" as you characterize it to be. It provides that Federal revenues from the outer Continental Shelf shall be "held in a special account during the present national emergency and, until the Congress shall otherwise provide, the moneys in such special account shall be used only for such urgent developments essential to the national defense and national security as the Congress may determine and thereafter shall be used exclusively as grants in aid of primary, secondary, and higher education."

By this language the amendment dedicates the potentially vast Federal revenues from outer Continental Shelf oil and minerals to grants in aid to education throughout the United States. It creates a trust fund for generations to come. By placing these funds in trust, the amendment insures that needed legislation for school construction, better pay for teachers, improved equipment, and other sorely needed assistance will be voted by future Congresses.

In recent Congresses grants in aid to education have been made only for so-called federally impacted areas, that is, those where Army and defense-plant installations have created school problems beyond the means of local communities. But attempts to apply that pattern to the overcrowded, understaffed schools throughout the United States have been defeated by the injection of divisive and poorly grounded arguments. For instance, religious issues have been used to oppose support for Federal aid to education and to pit group against group in a manner and on an issue which should have no place in a democracy such as ours.

With a trust fund specifically dedicated to education, these tactics would be less effective and probably could be overcome.

Your editorial states, "There is involved, too, the big question whether Federal aid to education is desirable at all, bearing in mind the probability that control will go hand in hand with help."

It should be pointed out that since 1787, when the famous Northwest Ordinance was enacted, Federal assistance has been given to local education. The Morrill Act is another piece of Federal legislation providing aid to schools from the Federal Government. Almost every State in the Union has a State college or university which has received Federal land grants.

It is significant that none of this Federal aid has resulted in interference with local control of education.

The system of grants-in-aid to the States has been used for many important social programs, with appropriate emphasis upon local autonomy.

The Hill amendment, far from being a mere gesture, would be a great, historic, and progressive step.

The recent tidelands giveaway to a few coastal States resulted from the cynical campaign promises made during the election crusade. It cost the people of the United States well over \$50 billion, which could have been devoted to extraordinary defense expenditures and education. The Hill amendment, had it been added to the Tidelands Act, would have been the most practical means of reducing the cost of defense to the American taxpayer.

Unfortunately, the people of the United States were not aware of the serious results of the tidelands giveaway until it was too late, despite the fact that the Supreme Court held three times that the Federal Government had paramount jurisdiction over the area and that the coastal State claims were invalid.

By tying the outer Continental Shelf revenues to aid-to-education, the American people would be taking out an insurance policy that no new land grab on the Continental Shelf would take place. The parents and teachers of America would help see to that.

This bill went to conference on July 20. The House bill does not contain the Hill amendment, so that the conferees of both Houses must agree to its inclusion in the bill. If they do, the House of Representatives must adopt its conferees' action.

Conferees who voted against the Hill amendment in the Senate were: HUGH BUTLER, Republican, of Nebraska; GUY COR-

DON, Republican, of Oregon; EUGENE MILLIKIN, Republican, of Colorado.

House conferees are: LOUIS E. GRAHAM, Republican, of Pennsylvania; PATRICK J. HILLINGS, Republican, of California; WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH, Republican, of Ohio; RUTH THOMPSON, Republican, of Michigan; EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York; FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, and J. FRANK WILSON, Democrat, of Texas.

I am writing this letter to you for publication so that your readers may have an opportunity to learn about both sides of the question.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, by way of argument, I desire to read but a few paragraphs of the letter. Like most of my speeches, it is a rather lengthy letter, and I shall not read it in its entirety. But in the letter I said:

In your editorial of July 3, entitled "Oil for Education" you minimize the importance of the Hill oil-for-education amendment to the outer Continental Shelf bill, both of which passed the Senate recently.

The oil-for-education amendment is not a "pious gesture" as you characterize it to be. It provides that Federal revenue from the outer Continental Shelf shall be "held in a special account during the present national emergency and, until the Congress shall otherwise provide, the moneys in such special account shall be used only for such urgent developments essential to the national defense and national security as the Congress may determine and thereafter shall be used exclusively as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education."

By this language the amendment dedicates the potentially vast Federal revenues from outer Continental Shelf oil and minerals to grants-in-aid to education throughout the United States. It creates a trust fund for generations to come. By placing these funds in trust, the amendment insures that needed legislation for school construction, better pay for teachers, improved equipment and other sorely needed assistance will be voted by future Congresses.

In recent Congresses grants-in-aid to education have been made only for so-called federally impacted areas, that is, those where Army and defense plant installations have created school problems beyond the means of local communities. But attempts to apply that pattern to the overcrowded, understaffed schools throughout the United States have been defeated by the injection of divisive and poorly grounded arguments. For instance, religious issues have been used to oppose support for Federal aid to education and to pit group against group in a manner and on an issue which should have no place in a democracy such as ours.

With a trust fund specifically dedicated to education, these tactics would be less effective and probably could be overcome.

Your editorial states "There is involved, too, the big question whether Federal aid to education is desirable at all, bearing in mind the probability that control will go hand in hand with help."

It should be pointed out that since 1787, when the famous Northwest Ordinance was enacted, Federal assistance has been given to local education. The Morrill Act is another piece of Federal legislation providing aid to schools from the Federal Government. Almost every State in the Union has State college or university which has received Federal land grants.

It is significant that none of this Federal aid has resulted in interference with local control of education.

The system of grants-in-aid to the States has been used for many important social programs with appropriate emphasis upon local autonomy.

The Hill amendment, far from being a "mere gesture," would be a great, historic, and progressive step.

Mr. President, I say to the people of my State that what we ought to do is to place the money in trust. Certainly it is to be implemented later by the Federal aid to education legislative program, but the important thing is to preserve and to conserve these funds in trust for the school children of America until such time as Congress will be able to give due deliberation to various proposals for implementing the Federal aid to education legislative enactment.

TREES, NATURE, AND MEN OF THE SOUTH

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the industrial revolution which is taking place in the new South is a dynamic factor in the economic well-being of our entire Nation. On June 10 I spoke to you about some of the tremendous strides that have been made—of the courage, the self-reliance, the independent initiative which have marked the progress of the South's business and industrial growth. And I spoke to you about the textile industry—of how the spindles of progress within that industry are turning to provide opportunities for thousands of workers and hundreds of communities.

Today I should like to speak further about the new South. I should like to tell of another industry that is proving an example and an inspiration to Americans everywhere. For the next few minutes I should like to speak about an industry that refused to die.

This industry is one which was marked for the grave not many decades ago. The economic doctors of those earlier years said that there was no hope—that the patient was disintegrating to nothingness and would never lead a healthy life again.

The patient of which I speak is the lumber industry—today one of the strongest, soundest, most agile industries in the South.

Now operating 34 percent of all industrial plants in the South, southern lumber manufacturing is one of the finest examples anywhere of an industry that has, of its own initiative and foresight, made itself a healthy and growing part of our Nation's economic advancement.

Let us go back for a few moments and see how this industry met its challenges. Let us examine the history of southern lumbering. It is a lesson from which other industries—and other regions—can profit. For the southern lumber industry is a prime example of business foresight combined with self-rejuvenation.

Forests and their products have been among our most precious assets in the South for many years. In the old days they provided our forefathers with shelter and fuel, plus some products for sale

or trade. Our woods in the Southeast were the home of the original "tar heels," and for generations tar, pitch, and turpentine were among the major contributions of this era to national and world commerce. In fact, it is a matter of historical record that the first ship returning from Jamestown to London in 1608 included in its cargo pitch, tar, clapboard, and wainscot. That was the birth of America's export lumber trade.

Not many years later the first real sawmill in this country was built. It was set up at a waterfall near Richmond more than three centuries ago. What a long way the lumber industry has come since then.

Most of the early pioneers that settled in this country did not consider the forests as a great natural resource; in fact, to them, the forests were actually a barrier. They were interested in cutting away the trees so that they could have land for farming, for homes and stockades.

In later years, when the forest lands were used more and more for lumber operations, it was only natural that the forests should be regarded as inexhaustible. Sawmill operators and loggers of those early years had no worry about timber supply. They knew that when they had cut out the forests at one location there was always another supply of trees a little farther on.

Crude logging practices and indiscriminate burning of the woods for grazing led to the assumption that the South's timberland would soon be depleted. Just after the beginning of this century economists, hard-headed businessmen, conservationists, and even some of the timber owners talked with all sincerity about the South's disappearing forests.

Here is what one of them had to say:

There has been so much capitalistic exploitation of southern forests that in another decade southern forest land will be barren. The cut of southern pine is falling off and before long the merchantable timber will not even be enough to fill the requirements of the Southern States themselves.

Many of the lumbermen transferred their operations to the west coast, but others decided to wait and work and see what the trees would do.

The little trees did not let them down. They took root. They spread their branches and covered the barren land from which the older trees had been cut away.

Far from being depleted, the forests of the South today are supplying a greater volume and far greater value of wood products than they have ever yielded. During the past several decades, southern lumbermen have allied themselves with nature to grow and protect the trees, while at the same time selectively cutting a very substantial share of the Nation's forest products. Not only did they nurse an ailing industry back to good health, they have made it one of the most robust industries in the Nation.

The record stands out boldly that the men who predicted forest famine in the South overlooked one important point—

the fact that trees grow. They seemed to overlook the fact that trees are not mined like coal and copper, but are harvested, like cotton and corn. Trees, like any agricultural crop, can be harvested again and again. When one is cut, another can be grown in its place.

It will be no surprise to those among us who have eyes to see and ears to hear to be reminded that forest products have achieved a place of major importance in the new South. The real testimonial lies, of course, in the forests of the South, which today supply about two-fifths of the Nation's lumber. Today more than 183 million acres of southern land is forested. This makes the South the largest commercial forest area of our Nation. Nearly three-fifths of the total area of some of our States are covered with forest growth. This compares with forests covering less than one-fourth of the United States as a whole. Twelve of our Southern States, comprising only 18 percent of the total land area of our Nation, contain 40 percent of the country's commercial forest land.

Among the most striking examples of heavily forested States are Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, whose combined forest areas of nearly 70 million acres represent a ratio of almost 3 acres of woods to every 5 acres in the area.

Especially heavily forested are the wondrous Appalachian Highlands and the Lower Coastal Plain in South Carolina. Other extensive forest areas are found in a wide belt stretching from Virginia to east Texas. This is the area in which southern pine is grown. Southern pine constitutes about 30 percent of all lumber used in the United States.

From the vast forests of the South come nearly 40 percent of the Nation's lumber products and 60 percent of America's pulpwood. Southern forests also provide 100 percent of the naval stores produced in this Nation.

Worn out? Depleted? Far from it when the southern region leads the Nation in forest commodities, as it does today.

They said the patient would die. Yet, still standing in the southern forests are some 338 billion board feet of sawtimber—more than half of it Southern Pine. This sawtimber volume is equivalent to 25 times the average annual lumber production in the South for the past 10 years. Moreover, the Southern Pine sawtimber is growing at a rate of almost 34 million board feet every day. This means that at exactly this time tomorrow we will have added 34 million board feet of new sawtimber to the South's wooded warehouse. In other words, during the next 24 hours enough new growth will be added to Southern Pine trees to build 3,400 average American homes.

Trees are a renewable resource. That is one of the factors which gives the South an advantage. Partly because of climate and partly because of the soil, our area contains some of the fastest-growing forests of the world. Our Southern Pine trees grow to pulpwood size in

only 15 to 30 years, and sawlogs of hardwood as well as Southern Pine can be produced in 35 to 60 years. Contrast this with the much slower growth in the Northern States and in Canada.

This rapid growth is a particularly important factor where so much of the forested area is held in smaller tracts by private owners. Here, the same man who carries out improved forestry in his youth has a fair chance of participating in the harvesting.

Our forests differ sharply from those of the West in the prevalence of many smaller areas in private ownership. Nearly four-fifths of all our forests are privately owned; the forest industrial concerns hold about 13 percent and the Government about 9 percent.

The Southeast has more than 1,500,000 small forest owners, with an average holding of 75 acres. These frequently intermingle or adjoin relatively large commercial holdings, many of which are held by lumber or paper manufacturers. This close association of farm-owned land with company-owned land has many advantages, chief of which is the market available to the farmers. In an average year about 90 percent of the pulpwood in the South is harvested on woodlands owned by farmers and other nonindustrial owners.

The lumber and pulpwood manufacturing industries have been working closely with small landowners—encouraging them to grow more trees. The tree-farm movement, for example, now embraces 15,723,220 acres in 10 of our Southern States. Inaugurated in the South only 11 years ago, this program has set standards among woodland owners—large and small—and is showing them how they can harvest regular crops of wood through the practice of good forest management.

The tree-farm program is a national movement which provides public recognition for private landowners who have applied sound forest practices on their holdings. The South now has more than 50 percent of the Nation's tree farms and nearly 60 percent of the certified tree-farm acreage.

Today, with tree farming established as a sound economic venture, and with demand for forest products increasing, our fellow farmers and foresters are increasingly active in helping nature grow more trees for tomorrow.

Wiser woodland management, improved harvesting methods, better timing of harvesting, better protection from fire, insects, and disease, and increased emphasis on planting with small trees where natural seed sources failed to reforest the area, are among the many actions being carried on to assure resources for the future in southern industries. Were it not for losses caused by fire, insects, and disease the forests of the South would be growing timber faster than it is being removed. In fact, they would be building up a surplus of well over 800 million cubic feet of new wood each year. Sawtimber takes bigger trees, so the solution takes more time and more thought. I ask unanimous consent that a table, prepared by the United States Forest Service, showing

ing where we stood in 1945, when the latest figures were assembled, be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Annual growth	Annual drain (fire, insects, and disease)	Commodity withdrawal	Total removed	Percent removal of growth
All timber (thousands of cubic feet).....	6,150,000	840,000	5,316,000	6,156,000	99.9
Sawtimber (thousands of board feet).....	19,102,000	2,188,000	21,493,000	23,681,000	80.6

Source: All figures are for 1945, "Facts About the South's Forests and Forest Products," published by American Forest Products Industries, Inc., 1951-52 edition, from U. S. Forest Service and U. S. Department of Commerce sources.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, one of the heaviest sources of timber loss is from forest fires. In 1950, 13,695,417 acres of forest land were burned—an area equal approximately to that harvested for pulp and paper during the year. Each year more and more timberland is being given full protection by the State forester and his organization, but as yet only the States of Alabama, South Carolina, and Virginia have developed their programs to provide organized protection for all timberlands within their borders. For the South as a whole, however, protection is provided for about three-fourths of the acreage.

All is not perfect, even in the South, for we, too, have a few who would set the woods on fire. Fortunately, they are fewer and fewer with the years, but even in 1950 incendiaries were the cause of 36,817 fires in the 12 Southern States. In addition, debris burners were careless and started 12,574 fires, and 11,008 were started by castoff stubs of cigarette smokers. Natural causes, such as lightning, resulted in only 571 fires, but, taken together, they made a heavy, and largely unnecessary, drain upon our forests.

To partially offset this loss, the State nurseries grew and distributed at cost a total of 264,225,000 little trees. Landowners planted these on 288,190 acres. This is a record of which we can be proud, but it is far short of the 13,695,417 acres that were burned. When we catch up with our fire losses we will have gone far toward putting our forest growth on a balance with the removal.

For four of our Southeastern States the planting score was as indicated in another table which I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State	Nursery output (thousands of trees)	Acres planted
Alabama.....	26,012	20,774
Georgia.....	45,237	55,874
North Carolina.....	10,000	13,373
South Carolina.....	34,429	29,741

Source: Facts, etc., op. cit. p. 15.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, most important of all the forest product industries, old and new, is the old standby, lumber. After a tremendous upsurge in lumber production which reached a peak in 1909, a decline set in, but since 1939 the industry has been marked by a steady gain. This is shown in the table which I ask to be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Lumber production in 12 Southern States
[In million board feet]

Year	Total hardwood	Total softwood	Total lumber
1869.....	357	1,136	1,493
1879.....	628	2,174	2,802
1889.....	1,302	4,277	5,579
1899.....	2,250	9,815	12,065
1909.....	3,890	17,308	21,198
1919.....	3,129	13,741	16,870
1929.....	4,080	12,145	16,225
1939.....	2,134	8,158	10,292
1945.....	4,112	7,393	11,505
1946.....	5,141	9,618	14,759
1947.....	4,039	9,600	13,639
1950.....	4,685	9,904	14,589

Mr. MAYBANK. Alabama ranks first in lumber production in the South, and is exceeded only by Oregon, Washington, and California.

I present another table for inclusion in the RECORD, relating to four Southeastern States.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Lumber production in 4 Southeastern States

State	Lumber production, thousands of board feet, 1950	Percent of United States production
Alabama.....	2,138,629	5.62
Georgia.....	2,017,900	5.30
North Carolina.....	1,993,581	5.24
South Carolina.....	951,333	2.50
Total South.....	14,589,336	38.38

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, southern lumbermen have come a long way in helping nature produce a better product of the forests. They have made giant strides in merchandising their plants for more efficient utilization of timber resources. A lumber machinery exposition held in April for southern pine manufacturers gives us insight as to some of the modern machinery being used to eliminate excessive waste in sawing and to provide better quality control at all stages of lumber production.

On display, for example, were machines used to remove the bark from pine logs before they are sawn. Several of these debarkers have been installed at various southern pine mills. This new development utilizes slabs and edgings, formerly used for fuel. This "waste" material now is cut into chips, providing raw material for the paper mills. The increasing quantity of wood chips thus

available will materially reduce the volume of young trees harvested annually as pulpwood. This is just one of the many ways southern lumber manufacturers have used their own ingenuity and foresight in bettering their industry and making a natural resource more effective in its service to mankind.

Another of the great advancements resulting from the lumber industry's efforts to improve the effective utilization of its product has been in the development of glued-laminated lumber—the production of large-sized beams and arches by gluing together pieces of smaller size. It is now possible to build up strong wood beams, trusses, and arches of practically unlimited size and shape by gluing small pieces together.

As I pointed out earlier, southern forests yield 60 percent of the Nation's pulpwood. To an increasing extent the paper and lumber industries are working together to achieve efficient utilization of the timber supply.

The pulp and paper industry owns an estimated 9 million acres of forest land in the South. As I indicated earlier in this speech, close to 90 percent of the industry's requirements are being cut from other lands, most of which are in farm ownership.

Pulpwood production in this area has been sharply upward since the 1930's. There is much reason to anticipate further increases, for we as a nation import large amounts of this material from Canada and even from overseas, sometimes at very high prices.

The 68 pulp and paper mills of the South include 4 new and modern newsprint mills, capable of producing about 200,000 tons of newsprint each year. This is about 20 percent of the newsprint manufacturing capacity of the United States, but less than 4 percent of the amount annually consumed in this country. Most southern mills produce what is known as Kraft paper, and the entire production of our pulp and paper mills is in the neighborhood of 9 million tons, worth more than \$2 billion.

A study by McLaughlin and Robock shows that, of all the new manufacturing enterprises involving investment of more than \$100,000 which have been started in the South, "probably the largest completely new postwar enterprise was the Coosa River Newsprint Co., a \$10,000,000 plant which was sponsored and financed by southern newspaper publishers who acquired a Government-owned ordnance plant at Childersburg, Ala."—Glenn E. McLaughlin and Stefan Robock, *Why Industry Moves South—A Study of Factors Influencing the Recent Location of Manufacturing Plants in the South*, Committee of the South, National Planning Association, 1949, 148 pages.

In the efforts to lengthen the useful life of food and thus conserve it, no single effort is more worthy of consideration than the extensive preservative treatment of poles for use by rural-electrification lines in many parts of the country. A specific illustration of this is the new wood-processing plant of the American Lumber and Treating Co. at Florence, S. C. The South Carolina plant is double the capacity of the earlier one,

and serves as a service station to process lumber, poles, timbers, and ties for others. The development cost about three-fourths of a million dollars and employs nearly 200 men.

We can well see how much the forest products industries have meant to the economy of the South. If southern lumbermen had thrown up their hands in helplessness during those gloomy days of a few dozen years ago, or if they had shirked in a let-George-do-it attitude, the New South would not be in as strong a position as it is in today. Instead, they put their hands to work, pulled on the bootstraps themselves, and the results can be readily seen.

There are ghost towns no more in the South. The lumber communities—and you can observe them everywhere—are thriving towns whose livelihoods are based on a permanent industry. The lumber mills are providing payrolls that help support the merchants, the doctors, the lawyers, the ministers, and the laborers in hundreds of the busy lumber communities. And outside of town, in the country-side, the forests are providing cash crops to thousands of landowners.

More than 369,000 southerners are directly employed in the production of lumber and timber basic products, making the industry second only to textiles. This amounts to 15 percent of all industrial employees in the South. In the number of active plants, the lumber industry ranks first, with 17,561 mills. The annual payroll amounts to \$958 million. Certainly, the forests are making an active contribution to the South's economic prosperity.

Trees have been growing in the South for millions of years. During most of this time, the trees grew through their regular cycle, reaching maturity, dying, falling uselessly into decay. They were of no service.

Now, however, the trees of the South are making an overwhelming contribution to the people of this land. They are serving us in the building of homes, schools, churches, and factories. And they are supplying raw materials for industry. They are fulfilling their destiny.

We know that there will always be plenty of trees for this great industry in the South. Moreover, we know that the present and future of the industry is in good hands. For man is working with nature to make the achievements of southern lumbering possible. Nature and man are working hand in hand to grow more trees—and to put the trees to good use.

Only a generation ago, southern lumbermen urged their sons and grandsons to seek their goals in life through the professions or in other businesses or even in other regions. That was a time when there was a feeling that the forest industries of the South offered less in the way of permanence or stability. But today the young men are remaining in the industry. They are finding new opportunity for enterprise and progress.

The South is growing crops of new trees. The South also is growing and retaining men with the vision to put those trees to work for mankind.

Now Mr. President, my reason for having spoken at this time is that there was reported from the Banking and Currency Committee today a bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] providing that national banks be authorized to make loans on standing timber. National banks may make loans under this bill, in the forest areas of the West or South, or wherever such loans are needed. So far as the Southeast is concerned, many representatives of the sawmill business, the logging business, the pulp business, and timber owners have written me urging that the bill be passed. I believe it is proper for national banks to be permitted to make loans to this great industry, and I hope the bill will be enacted without delay.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to commend the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina for his very fine remarks and his recital of the very interesting facts with reference to the tree industry in the South, particularly the Southeast, and for his urging passage of the bill to extend credit to timber growers. Credit is one of the great needs of our area. I think long-term credit for our timberland is one of the benefits to which we can look forward.

Mr. MAYBANK. I notice the senior Senator from Oregon on the floor. I wonder if I may have his attention. I was speaking of the necessity of the passage of the bill the Senator from Oregon has introduced, which permits national banks to make loans on standing timber. I made a speech previously on the lumber industry in the Southeast?

Mr. CORDON. I appreciate the Senator's statement. I know the matter is one of very real importance all over the timber areas of the South, as it is in the West.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the interest of the Senator from Oregon in the South.

Mr. MAYBANK. Money is hard to get today.

Mr. STENNIS. As the Senator knows, a forest does not yield income for many years. Lumbering is an industry requiring long-term credit. Fortunately, some oil and gas has been discovered in Mississippi, but I have said many times that long after they are gone, the pine trees will still be furnishing thousands and thousands of men and women a livelihood.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the senior Senator from South Carolina in this worthy cause, and I commend him for the speech he has just made.

JURISDICTION OVER SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of con-

ference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ives in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am never very anxious to take the time of the Senate to inflict my views on Senators. My only reason for taking time to speak on the conference report is that during the course of my membership in the House and the Senate, I have built up something of a record with regard to devoting and dedicating a portion of the revenues from the Continental Shelf to the cause of education.

During the debate on the bill when it was before the Senate, it was my privilege, in the absence of the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], to present an amendment, in behalf of myself and him, proposing the dedication of revenues from the Continental Shelf on a per capita basis. I may say that my own feeling is that had that approach been used throughout the history of the cause, we might be further along than we are now.

The trouble is that when the method which will be used for distribution is left, we permit all the specters and bogies of Federal control of education to defeat the basic objective. Now we have arrived at a very difficult situation, namely, whether, facing the adjournment of Congress, we wish to permit the uncertain status of the potential revenues of the Continental Shelf to continue in an uncertain status, and possibly to have rights developed or claims accrue which would plague us in any future action.

Because of that, a difficult question is presented to those of us who have felt there may have been a legitimate, effective, and productive dedication of these revenues, while, at the same time, we did not wish the resources to be claimed either by the States or by interests which might establish some priority of use.

In my own case, the whole matter is related to the Louisiana Purchase and the place of my State in the Louisiana Purchase. It happened that the day we were voting on the bill, or were discussing it preparatory to a vote in the Senate, was the 150th anniversary of the signing of the Louisiana Purchase. In observance of the anniversary, the Governor of my State, Sigurd Anderson, called upon Badger Clark, poet laureate of South Dakota, to write a poem to commemorate the Louisiana Purchase.

Mr. Clark is a writer generally of western verse, but he did write a poem, and he wrote in the colloquialism of "A Commonsensical Yankee of 1803," the year of the Louisiana Purchase. Because of its collateral relationship, and because it is not very long, and because it might offer a little diversion at a time when many Senators are at dinner, I shall read the poem. I think it ought to be a part of the story because, when all is said and

done, it bears perfectly upon the issue involved. This is the poem:

THE LOUISIANA PURCHASE

(By a "commonsensical" Yankee of 1803)

Old Tom Jefferson, what do you mean,
Buying up land that we've never seen,
All Louisiana for a whopping sum,
From the Mississippi River to Kingdom
Come?

And we only know that there's rain and snow
And grass and Injuns and buffalo.

Old Tom Jefferson, what's it worth,
A desert half-way around the earth,
A thousand miles from a road or track?
How do you get there and how get back?
Your horse might skip and your keel-boat
zip

But you'd still grow old and die on the trip.

Old Tom Jefferson, it's too far away.
Only miracles could make it pay—
Ships that sail against a river's power
Wagons that go 20 miles an hour—
And the pioneers on our old frontiers
Won't get it settled in a thousand years.

Old Tom Jefferson, I tell you what,
Little New Orleans was all you got—
Fifteen million for the soggy port
And the rest thrown in for a bit of sport.
The Frenchies knew when the deal went
through
That Napoleon had bamboozled you.

Old Tom Jefferson, we'll never see
Your wild Stony Mountain, wherever they
be,
And your buffalo pastures may just do
For a place to banish our rascals to.
You've paid a lot for we don't know what,
And our 15 million has gone to pot.

Old Tom Jefferson, once you shone,
Jarred the footings of the British throne,
Shaped the Declaration with your hand,
Trumpeted the liberty through the land,
So for old times' sake, in this big mistake
We'll forgive a good man, one bad break.

—Badger Clark.

After all, that represented the opinion of a great many people in the United States in 1803. It was similar to the purchase of Alaska, which was later described as Seward's Folly. The questionable authority the President had in 1803 for the negotiation of the purchase made even Tom Jefferson pause before he put his name or authorized the signing of the purchase agreement.

But the fears of that day disappeared. The mountains were reached. New Orleans, "the old soggy port" the poet speaks of, was not all we got. We got a great part of the middle mass of the continent which today constitutes a vast part of the Nation.

Now we have the Continental Shelf. In 1803 no one dreamed that the Continental Shelf might have great potential values. I should like to see the revenues from the Continental Shelf dedicated to the cause of education, much as we dedicated portions of land in sections 16 and 36 throughout many of the States of the Northwest to the cause of education.

I introduced a bill on this subject in the House of Representatives in 1949. I reintroduced the proposed legislation in the Senate. I have constantly voted for every measure that proposed to accomplish this purpose.

At the same time, and by the same token, I felt that the Louisiana Purchase

was a part of the whole United States I feel that my State of South Dakota and the States of Missouri, Kansas, North Dakota, and portions of Wyoming and Montana, have a right to share in the resources developed in the Gulf of Mexico, to the extent that they have come to us by reason of the Louisiana Purchase.

I am reluctant to accept the situation which we have now, a situation in which, if we do not do something now, we shall not get a Continental Shelf bill. In other words, the ownership of the Continental Shelf might again be claimed by the States immediately adjoining. Rights might be asserted or claims might be made by those who have been prospecting there or those who, by use of one sort or another, seek to establish certain claims. So, very reluctantly, I have come to the conclusion that in this situation I shall have to vote to adopt the conference report; but in so doing I wish to state for the RECORD that I expect to use what ever energy I have and whatever efforts I can bring to bear, to join with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and with other Senators, I hope, in dedicating a portion of the receipts—even though we do not do it in this bill—to the cause of education, and providing for their distribution on a per capita basis or some other definite, certain basis, so that the spectre of Federal control will not block the success of the measure, as would be the case under the amendment which the Senate adopted.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I commend the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for this very clear expression of his concern and his future intentions. In respect to this report, I certainly will join with him, as he pledges himself to a solution of this problem at some appropriate time later, either in the next session or at some future session of the Congress.

When I was necessarily absent, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota handled the amendment which we had offered together and he put up a valiant fight to have it written into the pending legislation. I think it is unfortunate that that amendment was not adopted. I think if it had been adopted, we all could support the pending conference report with a great deal more enthusiasm and a great deal more confidence. As things now stand, we do not know what will happen to the revenues which are expected from this new source for the Federal Government. Today, as I vote to support this conference report, I vote with great reluctance because of the void which seems to exist as a result of the lack of action with respect to the source of the revenues.

I wish to pay my respects to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], who has handled this very difficult legislation so ably and has given us all great confidence in the cause espoused under this legislation.

I wish also to commend the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOL- LAND] and the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] for the contribution they have made to this partial solution—and it is only a partial solution—of a very difficult problem.

Mr. CORDON and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If there are no further speeches, I wish to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CORDON. I rose to do that very thing.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	Martin
Anderson	Gore	Maybank
Barrett	Green	McCarran
Beall	Griswold	McCarthy
Bennett	Hayden	McClellan
Bricker	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bridges	Hennings	Monroney
Bush	Hickenlooper	Morse
Butler, Md.	Hill	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Murray
Byrd	Holland	Neely
Capehart	Humphrey	Pastore
Carlson	Hunt	Payne
Case	Ives	Potter
Chavez	Jackson	Purtell
Clements	Jenner	Robertson
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kefauver	Smathers
Douglas	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Duff	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Knowland	Sparkman
Eastland	Kuchel	Stennis
Ellender	Langer	Symington
Ferguson	Lehman	Thye
Flanders	Lennon	Watkins
Frear	Long	Welker
Fulbright	Magnuson	Wiley
George	Malone	Williams
Gillette	Mansfield	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ives in the chair). A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I first want to recognize what I think is the very great wisdom and sense of realism which has been displayed by the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], in stating that, though they were in support of the aid-for-education amendment, they feel the situation now confronting the Senate is such that they would be derelict to their duty in getting a serious question solved and getting the Federal Government's production started, if they did not support the conference report.

I well recall that one of my distinguished friends a little while ago made the statement that he did not regard the Hill amendment as it now appears on the Senate bill as an idle gesture. I am sure he will pardon me if I differ completely from the conclusion. I believe the Hill amendment as it now appears in the Senate bill is an idle gesture, and above and beyond that it is a positive handicap to the performance of its duties by Congress in bringing to an end the

whole submerged lands question, which has been such a source of anxiety and worry to the Congress and to our people since 1937.

Mr. President, the first point I shall mention is that this question brought up here, namely, the effort to go back to conference, the desire to postpone final action because of the fact that the Hill amendment is not in the conference bill, is delaying settlement, and is injuring the cause of the Nation and is a handicap to our completion of a duty which is a highly important duty.

I want to call the attention of the Senate to something that the Senator from Oregon was too modest to mention, and that is that, except for the discarding of the Hill amendment, the bill as reported by the conferees is a complete victory for the Senate and for the Senate version. That is due almost in whole to the tremendous efforts and the very fine leadership of the Senator from Oregon in spending the months that were involved in the consideration of the two bills, in trying to bring out a sane bill dealing with the outer Continental Shelf, and likewise to the fine devotion of every member of that committee, who, regardless of differences of opinion, worked together those many weeks and months until they came out with a bill which has become the conference bill, except in the matter of the elimination of the Hill amendment, which was not on the bill reported by our committee.

I call attention to the fact that not only was the Hill amendment not on the committee bill, but that hearings were held on the Hill amendment, both in connection with the tidelands bill earlier this year and later on this particular measure.

The distinguished Senator from Alabama, whose name is borne by the Hill amendment, appeared before the committee, and was supported by others from educational groups and labor organization and, in the first hearing, by the Americans for Democratic Action, and various other groups.

The committee in its wisdom eliminated the Hill provision, because it was so clear to the committee, as it must be clear to anyone who will look at the facts, that it has no definite relationship to the subject matter of the whole legislation, and that instead, it is serving as a handicap to prevent earlier action which would come from Congress.

I remind Members of the Senate that, in the first place, we passed the tidelands bill, returning to the States, in addition to other waters and lands, the submerged coastal lands extending from the low-water mark out to the State boundaries.

In the course of that debate it was stated, not once but repeatedly, that there would follow another bill, which is the pending measure, affecting the Continental Shelf, a more important measure, as to its effects, by a great deal than was the tidelands bill.

Why is it more important? First, it covers nine-tenths of the submerged lands between the low-water mark and the edge of the Continental Shelf. In other words, nine-tenths of the area adjoining our coast from one end of the Nation to the other is embraced in the

bill before us. One-tenth of the land lying closest to the shore was contained in the other measure.

In the next place, five-sixths of the assets—that is, the known or estimated assets of oil and gas—and most of them are estimated by our geological experts, although some are known—five-sixths of those assets lie outside the State boundaries and are contained in the area covered in the pending bill, which covers only the outer Continental Shelf.

There were those who had great concern when we passed the tidelands bill, because they thought the Senate and the Congress was without resolution to go ahead and give the Federal Government that which belongs to it and that which the Senator from Florida has contended, ever since he has been a Member of the Senate, belongs to the Federal Government, and to not only recognize the title of the Federal Government but to give it the machinery and the tools and the needed legislation so it can go ahead and develop that which our country needs and that which alone can produce revenue from this great, vast, rich area.

The bill before us will do just that, and it should put always to an end the fears of those who thought there would not be the stern resolution found in the Senate or in the House of Representatives to go ahead and recognize as belonging to the Federal Government that which at least the vast majority claimed in the other debate did belong to the Federal Government, while we were recognizing the special claim by the States to their submerged lands within their boundaries, which historically for 150 years they did claim and did occupy and did use as fully as any use could be made at that time of that land.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. It has always seemed to me that those who are opposed to the tidelands bill have recognized that there was an impasse between the President and the Congress. While we had a Democratic administration, both Houses would vote to pass the tidelands bill, and then the President would veto it. Although two-thirds of the Members of the Senate were prepared to pass the bill over the President's veto, two-thirds of the Members of the House would not pass the bill over the President's veto.

But when the bill came up again, some Members of the Senate succeeded in hanging the Hill amendment onto it. The fight over the Hill amendment was older than the fight over the tidelands bill. The Hill amendment was one which the Senate had always been willing to adopt, but which the House had never been willing to adopt.

When the tidelands bill and the Hill amendment were tied together, once again a legislative snag developed. The controversy over it could continue for many years.

Even though I believe some of us in the Senate voted properly in voting against the original bill, I believe we might as well proceed to have development made under Federal management, and thus dispose of one of those ques-

tions, and then at a later time see whether we can persuade the House of Representatives to go along in regard to Federal aid to education.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Louisiana. That is a concession which I believe marks him as a realist, as well as a patriot.

Mr. President, I think the situation is anomalous indeed, when we find that the very Senators who opposed passage of the tidelands bill, and who, as one part of their argument, advanced the fear that Congress would never get around to recognizing the rights of the Federal Government in the Continental Shelf, are the identical ones who are holding up action on the Continental Shelf bill, a bill so carefully drawn up by the Senate committee and so carefully acted upon by the Senate that the House has conceded the virtues of the bill and has agreed to it almost in full in the conference report, except for the rejection of the part which has been placed upon it by means of this amendment which, although well intended, has no more place on the body of this bill—where it will cause great trouble in terms of delaying and perhaps defeating enactment of the bill—than something entirely foreign to the subject matter.

I wish to comment first on the fact that unless the conference report is agreed to, we shall not have any legislation on this subject at this session. It is said there may be a special session later on, or that in any event Congress will be in session again in January. That may be true. Of course, we shall have nothing to do then! If there is a special session, it will be called because the work has piled up upon us so heavily that the country will demand that we return. If we do not return until January, we shall then have confronting us the greatest burden of legislation which I think has ever confronted the second session of any Congress for a long, long time. Yet there are those who would be perfectly willing to let the subject matter rest where it is, unenacted, and would be perfectly willing to delay the production of the oil and gas which belong to the Federal Government, and delay having poured into the coffers of the Federal Government the revenue from those resources, which is most sizable and badly needed. In that connection, I point out that we have on our desks tonight copies of a message from the President, which arrived here only a moment ago. That message relates to the need to raise the limit on the national debt. Yet here is one source of revenue which we have been attempting for a long, long time to have brought into the Federal Treasury. It is now within our grasp, except for the objections of some Members who opposed the tidelands bill and expressed great fear that those of us who favored the tidelands bill would not go along with enactment of the bill relating to the Continental Shelf. That is the anomalous situation which confronts the Senate and the country. In other words, those who are holding up enactment of the Continental Shelf bill are not the ones who supported the tidelands bill.

On the contrary, those who oppose enactment of the Continental Shelf bill are the ones who from the housetops and over the radio and television questioned the good judgment and also the intentions of the Senators who supported the tidelands bill, and asked dubiously whether we would be willing to have a bill relating to the Continental Shelf enacted into law.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. As I understand the issue, the only question is whether the revenue from the outer Continental Shelf shall be devoted to education or whether it shall be placed in the general fund of the Treasury.

Mr. HOLLAND. No; that is an issue that is proposed to be postponed for 3 years, because the so-called Hill amendment, now included in the Senate bill, provides that for 3 years the revenue will be available for expenditure for purposes of national defense. Even in that case, the revenue will not go into the general fund of the Treasury, but will remain idle until Congress proceeds to say, in effect, "Here is a defense project on which we will spend this money." Until Congress takes such further action, that will be the situation even for the 3 years, during which this important source of revenue will be tied up in the Treasury, which certainly needs some active and live money, but is being deprived of this particular money by the recalcitrance of folks who do not wish to have the Congress enact provision for legislative machinery giving to the Federal Government that which belongs to Uncle Sam.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Florida wishes to call the majority of the Senate recalcitrant, because, as he well knows, the majority of the Senate voted for the Hill amendment.

All we want is to have the House of Representatives given an opportunity, by means of rejection of the conference report, to vote on the proposition, first, that this revenue should be devoted to the national defense and, second, that this revenue should be devoted to education.

If the Senator from Florida can think of any better purpose to which the money could be devoted than the purpose of the defense of the country and, after that, education, I wish he would state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot think of anything better. I am in the fortunate position of having stood on the floor of the Senate and battled for the Federal aid to education bill, and of having gained at that time the high encomiums of my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. Just to complete the record and to preen my feathers a little, I should like to read into the RECORD a little later the encomiums of me uttered at that time by my good friend, the Senator from Alabama.

But in regard to the point that the House has not passed on this matter, let me say briefly that the now junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], then a Member of the House of Representatives, 2 years ago offered in the

House the Hill amendment to the then pending tidelands bill. A point of order was raised and sustained, under the rules of the House. The measure had not been considered by the committee which should have considered it. The measure had not cleared, as it should. So the point of order was sustained.

So this year, when the matter came up, in order to get the Hill amendment before the House, it was necessary to embrace it in substitute bills, which, if the Senate cares to read them, will be found to differ very little from the bills which have pending here, except in the matter of having the Hill amendment attached.

The first of those bills was a substitute bill introduced by Mr. FEIGHAN on the floor of the House on March 31, 1953. At this time I should like to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to present to the Senate, briefly, his description of that bill. I now read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 31, 1953, at page 2546.

Mr. PERKINS. The proposals the gentleman is offering here are identical, I believe, with the Hill proposal that was offered on the Senate side last year?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes, fundamentally it is identical, with just a few minor variations.

In the course of the exchange which continued, it was made very clear that the real purpose of the Feighan substitute bill was to get the Hill amendment before the House.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to conclude my statement that—

Mr. KEFAUVER. But I want the Senator from Florida to state that the purpose of the Feighan amendment was to devote to the cause of education all the revenue coming from the area between the 3-mile limit and the 9½ mile limit off the coast of West Florida and Texas.

Mr. HOLLAND. No; the Senator from Tennessee is wrong about that. He is talking now about the Perkins amendment, which I shall mention in a moment.

On the contrary, the Feighan amendment offered to the cause of education only the income from the area outside the State boundaries, as the Senator from Tennessee will see if he cares to read the amendment.

At any rate, what was the result of that debate? I repeat that it is to be found at pages 2546 to 2551 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 31, 1953. From that RECORD we find that on a division demanded by Mr. FEIGHAN, there were 28 ayes and 82 noes. In other words, by a vote of 82 to 28, the House turned down the Feighan amendment, including the Hill amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President—

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee will be patient, after I conclude my reference to the Feighan amendment, I shall be glad to yield.

Then Mr. FEIGHAN demanded tellers. I understand that in the House of Representatives in order to have a teller count, one-fifth of a quorum must join in the demand for the appointment of

tellers. One hundred and ten Members were present at that time, and it would have been necessary for 20 of the Members to have joined in the demand for the appointment of tellers. However, tellers were not appointed. So it is obvious that not as many as 20 Members of the House at that time, out of the 110 then present, were willing to go on record as demanding a teller vote on the Feighan amendment.

Now I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, since the Senator from Florida is so certain about the attitude of the House of Representatives, why does he object so strenuously to having the conference report returned to a further conference, so that thereafter it would be voted on again by the House of Representatives, where there could be a quick vote? In that way we could see what the House thinks at that time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Because the House has been ably represented by its conferees, and I think they know a great deal better than we do what the House wants. When the House conferees had yielded in the great majority of the instances to the Senate, but simply declined to yield on this one matter—which, as I shall show in a few minutes, is a completely unsound and idle gesture—I am not disposed to quarrel with those representing that coordinate body; I am not disposed to question whether they are representing that body carefully and properly. I think they are representing it carefully and properly; certainly I extend that presumption to them. I know of nothing to the contrary.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator must know that the Members of the House of Representatives have been quite as anxious to further the cause of education in the Nation as have the Members of the Senate. The Senator, upon inquiry and appraisal of the vote in the House, must appreciate the fact that the only opportunity the House has had to vote on the question has been with regard to revenue from the entire Continental Shelf, and that the House has never had an opportunity to vote on the revenue immediately outside the 3-mile limit, or the boundaries of the States. So why does the Senator object to giving the House an opportunity to express itself on this particular issue, if he is so certain as to what its attitude is.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida knows that the House of Representatives has been considering this matter since 1937. He knows it has been before the House repeatedly, and that there has been ample opportunity to consider it. He knows what happened to the Feighan amendment, which, as he reads it, has to do with adoption of the Hill amendment, with sufficient similarity in it to our other bills to enable us to know that that was what was presented. The distinguished Representative himself said that. The Senator from Florida does not think we should forego longer the development of the Continental Shelf values. He thinks that those who take

unto themselves the responsibility of denying to our Government, at this critical time in our finances, its rights to proceed immediately to begin the developments which were cut off in 1950, are taking the responsibility of staying the hand of our Nation in a most vital situation and at a most important time.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator let me ask a question at that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In view of the fact that we are now going to be confronted with an extension of the session for the purpose of enlargement of the debt limit, does not the Senator feel that we might at least get this very important matter of the dedication of the funds from the outer Continental Shelf established by a vote of the House of Representatives? I do not see that the time is so urgent, in view of the fact that the President has asked that we extend the debt limit. We have several days in which this question could be considered. It would take the House only 40 minutes to vote on it. I assume from his argument that the Senator believes if the House voted they would indicate they did not want the funds to be spent for purposes of education, but we who want to do something for the schools of the Nation are very anxious that the House of Representatives at least have an opportunity of voting directly on the issue. Will the Senator not join us in giving the House that opportunity?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida thinks the House has had abundant opportunity to speak on any aspect of this question that it wanted to speak on, and when the House managers expressed the unyielding verdict, for themselves and for the House, that they are satisfied with the conference report, which adopts the Senate bill, the Senator from Florida gives prima facie effect to their position. He thinks that they know the wishes of those whom they represent better than we do.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does the Senator think—

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield no further just now.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not blame the Senator for not yielding, for this question is one that would be difficult to answer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have yielded for a great many questions, and I intend to yield later, but I desire to continue briefly on the discussion.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I decline to yield at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida declines to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Now, on the Perkins bill. On the same day, and just as soon as the verdict of the House was rendered on the Feighan bill, Mr. Perkins introduced a substitute bill, and that bill is set forth in full in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD. Senators may see it if they desire to do so, and they will find that it, too, is an oil-for-education bill, and they will find that it was voted down by a voice vote. There was no demand either for a division vote or for a tally vote, because the House apparently had shown clearly how it felt on that particular question.

Mr. President, I have concluded my reference to the House. If the Senator from Tennessee has questions with reference to either of the two bills to which I referred, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I merely wanted to ask the Senator this question. He said he thought the conferees knew well the opinion of the House. Then why does the Senator fear presenting the matter directly to the House of Representatives?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has no fear about it at all. It would not make a serious difference to him if this measure had passed with the Hill amendment in it, but he thinks it is a bad amendment, because he thinks that anything that is an idle gesture and that holds out a hollow shell to good people is wrong, and he will not be a party to it if he can avoid it; and that is what the Hill amendment is.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator refers to an idle gesture and a hollow shell, yet the Senator, a few moments ago, was talking about the tremendous wealth and the great value of the resources beyond the boundaries of the States. So, if there is great wealth—

Mr. HOLLAND. Has the Senator a question for me? If so, I shall be glad to answer it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes. Does not the Senator think there is tremendous wealth which would be of great assistance to the schools and to education in the United States, wealth that exists beyond the boundaries of the States, which could be used for education, if the Hill amendment were adopted?

Mr. HOLLAND. No; the Senator from Florida does not at all agree with the assumption of the Senator from Tennessee, because, in order for it to be used for the purposes of aid to education, in the first place, 3 years would have to elapse; and, in the second place, in the first place, 3 years would have to pass. The Senator from Florida has supported the passage of two aid-to-education bills on the floor of the Senate, and he has seen a complete failure of the passage of those bills by the House at a time, he believes, when his friend was a Member of the House. The House declined and failed to pass those particular measures.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to make it clear to the Senator from Florida that the Senator from Tennessee voted for the Federal aid-to-education bill, but the question involved there was whether \$300 million should be appropriated for Federal aid to education.

In this case the valuable resource is already present. The Hill amendment

directs that it be used for educational purposes. The only thing the Congress would have to do, if the Hill amendment were adopted, would be to adopt a formula for the use of the proceeds for educational purposes, which would be a very easy thing to do, if the fund were already available. Does not the Senator agree?

Mr. HOLLAND. No; the Senator from Florida does not agree. The Senator from Florida thinks that in all probability the Senator from Tennessee is still quite as much in the minority in the thinking of the House as he was when he was a Member, and when he says he voted for Federal aid to education in the House—which I am sure is true since he states it—but the bills dismally failed of passage in the House. The Senator from Florida has no late information indicating any change in the situation.

Mr. President, the Senator from Florida can speak from a background of having fought for Federal aid to education on the floor of the Senate at a time when it was a thoroughly controversial measure. The Senator from Florida fought for two different bills, both of which passed the Senate by a very respectable vote; and both of which, incidentally, were not passed by the House of Representatives.

In the course of one of the debates—and I take a little pride in this, because I should like to think the Senator from Alabama was as right in 1949 when he said those kind things, as he is now when he still says kind things about my attitude toward education—I had taken a strong stand for the measure which gave aid to the States in accordance with need, and the Senator from Alabama asked this question:

Mr. HILL. Is it not a fact that the Senator's great State enjoys the distinction, among the Southern States, of not being one of the low-income States? I wanted to emphasize that, for the reason that I was afraid that because the Senator's State is right in the very heart of the South, some people might think he was speaking because his State was one of the low-income States. The Senator's State is certainly about the average in the matter of income. Is that not true? So the Senator this afternoon is not speaking with any particular reference to his own State. He is speaking for the cause involved here. Is that not true?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I commend the Senator—

These are the priceless words which I cherish now as I cherished them then—

I commend the Senator. He is always so able in his presentations—

I do not want to appear immodest, Mr. President. I am quoting from my friend from Alabama, from his verdict on the attitude of the Senator from Florida on the subject—

and he now has put his finger on the very thing that is involved in the controversy now before the Senate.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, I fought for that program, and the reason why I fought for it was because it was a program which had some bones and sinews in it. But

this empty shell to which we refer as the Hill amendment has neither bone nor sinew, because it is nothing in the world but a deferred promise which is going to mislead good people, and it should not be passed with any statements to the effect that here we have a Federal Aid-to-Education Act.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot yield further.

We were talking about \$300 million; we were talking about aid to education, which, by the way gave nothing to my State except as it was given to New York or to California—a minimum amount. I was talking about a program for protecting the sovereignty of the States. There were three ways of handling this: First, limiting it to public schools; second, including public, parochial, and private schools; third, leaving it to the States under their own laws.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield in order that I may clarify the Record?

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot yield at this time. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will excuse me.

Mr. President, this is a very hollow promise, containing nothing but words which say that for 3 years, by further action of Congress, the proceeds can be given to national defense, and thereafter the money shall be given as grants-in-aid to education. It does not contain a word about protecting public schools; it does not contain a word about what should be done for parochial schools or private schools, or about devoting the moneys to need existing in the various States to be handled under State law; but, instead, it is a program which invites every kind of fight and every kind of controversy prevailing heretofore and which would again prevail before we get any legislation.

So, Mr. President, I am not willing to put this kind of a hollow pumpkin shell to use and say it is Federal aid to education. I do not care whether the money goes to education or where it goes if it goes to a good purpose. But it will take a great deal more than this to do the job. The annual revenue, at the maximum, would be less than \$100 million. We had \$300 million in our earlier bill which was to be devoted for a beginning of Federal aid to education. But I am not willing to say to the people that we have done something here when we have not done it. Neither am I willing, by taking a position tonight with the Senators supporting the Hill amendment, to delay and to procrastinate in the settlement of this question which is important to the Nation. There never was a time when it was as important as it is right now.

There are many other things I should like to say about this matter, Mr. President, but I close by simply inviting attention to one fact, namely, that the Senator from Alabama himself admitted that he had greatly softened—that was the word he used—his amendment. He meant he had taken out any reference to public schools, to parochial schools, to preserving State control, to giving aid to those States that need it in proportion to their need. He has taken out everything that

would give form and substance and meaning to the act and has left only this hollow, empty promise deferred for years. I am not willing to defer longer the settlement of this vital matter which is of such importance to the Nation.

Mr. President, I strongly hope the conference report will be soundly adopted.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, since the Senator from Florida would not yield to me in the latter part of his remarks, I feel that I should make a few remarks to at least clarify the record.

It is quite apparent that those who are insisting upon the adoption of the conference report are unwilling to let the Members of the House of Representatives, if they can prevent it, have a vote on this very important issue. They must know, from the vigor of the fight they are presenting here, that the House of Representatives, like a majority of the Members of the Senate, would vote for the Hill amendment which provides for the use of the revenue for 3 years for the defense of the Nation, and, thereafter, as a great educational fund.

The Senator from Florida said the House had voted on this proposition several times previously. As a matter of fact, the House of Representatives has never voted on the question of whether it wants Federal aid to education.

I was mistaken a few minutes ago in stating that I had voted for Federal aid to education in the House. What I should have said is that I have been a sponsor of bills for Federal aid to education in the House on numerous occasions.

The fact is that there has been a very close division in House committee, so that Federal aid to education has never reached the House of Representatives for a vote.

The Senator from Florida is quite incorrect in saying that the House of Representatives has turned down, by substantial votes, bills providing for Federal aid to education. That has never happened. That issue has never reached the floor.

On many occasions a majority of the House, in one way or another, have indicated interest, but there has never been a vote in the House on the subject.

I cannot understand the reasoning of the Senator from Florida or of other Senators who are trying to ram this conference report through tonight. They do not want to give the House of Representatives an opportunity to vote on whether they want this newly found fund used, first, for national defense, for 3 years, and, next, as a great educational fund thereafter.

The Senator from Florida says he does not care what is done with the money; he does not care where it goes. So I cannot understand the position of the Senator from Florida. If he does not care where the money goes, why is he objecting to the House of Representatives at least voting on the issue?

The only thing I can think of that might be in the minds of those who are trying to ramrod the conference report through is that they do not want the great educational institutions and the people interested in education to have a hand in the fund, because they know they will protect it. They know

they will not be able to come to Congress in the future, saying, "Well, we have given the States the revenue derived from the submerged lands out to 3 miles—and 10½ miles in the case of Florida and Texas—and now we want you to extend the boundaries of the State and permit the money to be used for State purposes."

They know that if the educational interests of the United States see that the money is applied for the purpose of education, there will be substantial public opinion for seeing that it is applied there continuously, as has been the case of every special dedication to education.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] criticizes very bitterly the provisions of the Hill amendment, on the ground that the amendment does not prescribe whether the funds are to be used for parochial schools, public schools, or for other purposes. All the Hill amendment provides is a grant-in-aid to primary, secondary, and higher education.

I think it would have been very presumptuous on the part of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the co-sponsors of the amendment to have undertaken by this legislation to have spelled out exactly how the funds were to be used. The first thing to do is to establish a fund. Then I think Congress will have no trouble making provision for its use by way of grants-in-aid to States for primary, secondary, and higher education.

The need is great, and the demand is from every State in the Union. The salaries of teachers and facilities for schools demand that something be done. If the Senator from Florida has been so anxious to see Federal aid for education legislation enacted all these years, how can he now complain if the fund will be dedicated for that purpose?

Can anyone complain because the fund is to be used, for the first 3 years, for the defense of the United States? I do not think so. Those interested in education recognize that that is paramount. They are happy to wait the three years, to be procrastinated against for 3 years, with the understanding that after that period of time they will have the use of the funds.

This is a great opportunity to strike a telling blow in Congress for education, which, after all, differentiates the United States from many other nations. It is education which has enabled us to advance, to develop our resources, and to have the great form of Government we enjoy.

We know the need is great. I think the least we can do in the Senate is to give the Members of the House of Representatives, who, as we know, are just as much interested as we are, a chance to speak, not through the conference committee, which is not representative of the House, but through the House of Representatives itself. If the House of Representatives votes that it does not want this fund used for education, nothing else will be heard from many of us in the Senate. But, Mr. President, until the House of Representatives does speak, we shall entertain the opinion, based upon well-grounded facts, I am certain, that they fear defeat for the

sponsors of the conference report, that they know the House of Representatives will not stand by the conference report.

I should think the duty, at least on the part of the Senate conferees, is to insist that there be a vote on the amendment in the House, so that there can be an understanding and an agreement about what we are going to do with this valuable asset of the Nation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly in associating myself with the excellent remarks of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. I realize that differences of opinion are strongly held among Members of the Senate with respect to the so-called Hill amendment, but I believe the record ought to be made quite clear as to exactly what the purpose of the Hill amendment is, rather than to brand it as a hollow pumpkin shell, or to say that it is without form or substance, or does not give an accurate description.

I can well imagine what might have happened in the Senate had the Hill amendment tried to spell out every detail as to how the money should be used. In fact, the Hill amendment did but one thing. It dedicated funds for specific purposes—for primary, secondary, and higher education. It left in the hands of Congress the formula or the standards which would be provided for the disposition of the funds, such as to the States, under State laws, or, as the Senator from Florida pointed out, for public, private, and parochial schools. I can well imagine that there would have been a storm of protest, and justifiably so, if on the Continental Shelf bill we had tried to develop substantive legislation, if we had tried to spell out every last detail as to who should receive the money.

But there are some useful purposes for which the funds might be used. I think those purposes, as has been noted, are highly desirable: First, for the defense of our country, because the budget, or a very little portion of the budget, I should say, is for purposes of defense. Availability of an amount which can be dedicated to defense purposes, and thereby reduce what is now a normal cost of government, should be welcome. Under the Hill amendment, that would be for a 3-year period.

There is simply no way to estimate how much will be needed for the cause of education in the days to come. One point needs to be emphasized. This is a growing country. The population of the United States is growing at the rate of 2,700,000 persons a year. By 1960 the population of the United States will be 175 million. By 1975, according to present estimates, the population will be more than 200 million. I can assure every Senator that with such a population growth, the need for additional school facilities and the need for additional schoolteachers will be tremendous.

For example, I have in my possession an editorial dated July 7, published in one of the local newspapers of my State, the St. Paul Pioneer Press and Dispatch. I believe the second paragraph of the editorial tells the story. It reads:

About a million additional children are being added to the school population each year, now and in the years through 1960.

Not nearly enough teachers are being trained to take charge of the necessary new classrooms—and there are not nearly enough classrooms in which to put the children. Such is the situation of the public schools across the country.

There is no question more pressing than that of education and educational facilities.

Just a word about returning the conference report to conference. It would not be unusual. I remind the Senate that last year we were in session all night on the independent offices appropriation bill conference report. That bill contained the funds for the atomic energy program, if I am correctly informed. I recall that twice the report was sent back to conference, because the Senate felt that the House conferees were being adamant in their position, and that if we accepted the conference report, the whole atomic energy program might be jeopardized. So the Senate twice sent the bill back to conference, and we did not worry because we might have to stay a little longer. The argument was that what the bill provided was important for the security of the country. After all the atomic energy program is vital to the welfare and defense of the Nation. We insisted that the House conferees give in and accept the Senate language. Our insistence met with success, and we came out with a good conference report.

The educational needs of the children of the United States are important to the national security. The Senate of the United States has no moral or political obligation to accept the wishes of the House conferees. Every time a report comes back on a subject with respect to which the Senate has taken a positive, definite action, by a yea-and-nay vote on a substantive policy matter, we are told that the House will not go along with the Senate.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. This is an extremely important question, involving the dedication of this fund, whether it be for education or not. Is it not the rule of the House that on a conference report debate is limited to 1 hour to a side, so that if this report were sent back to be voted upon in the House, the total debate would be 1 hour to a side?

Mr. SPARKMAN. One hour altogether.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am reminded by my distinguished friend from Alabama that the total debate is 1 hour. Whether it be 1 hour or 2 hours, does not the Senator feel that the proponents of the conference report ought to be willing to risk 1 or 2 hours of debate to allow Members of the House to determine how they feel about this great issue?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do. I think the Senator from Tennessee has made his point crystal clear. I do not believe it is a point which has been appropriately or frankly answered in the debates this evening.

When the Senate has taken a firm position and said, "We will not yield on matters of basic policy," we have been able to carry the point and to win the case. Last year the Senate was in ses-

sion until 5 o'clock one Sunday morning. We sent the conference report on the independent offices bill back twice, on the question of the atomic energy program. Finally we got a report which, according to the Atomic Energy Commission, permitted the development of the atomic energy program along the lines which were necessary for the defense and security of the country.

Let me cite a more recent example. The other day in the Senate we debated the bill for the disposal of rubber plants. During the debate amendments were added to the committee bill. Committee bills are very important, but there is nothing sacred about a committee. Committees are not made up of bishops, deans of cathedrals, or other fine men of the clergy. They are composed of Senators—human beings. I have all the respect in the world for committees, but I know that many a committee bill has been amended on the floor of the Senate. Members of the Senate are very proud of some of their amendments.

The other day in connection with the rubber plant disposal bill the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] sponsored an amendment which we said was an important amendment. The committee was not for the amendment, but the amendment was adopted.

The distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] sponsored what I considered to be a very important amendment. The amendment was adopted. Those two amendments seemed so important that when the rubber plant disposal bill came back to the Senate from conference without those two amendments, the acting majority leader rose and said, "We cannot accept this conference report. Let us send it back to conference."

I have been informed today that, the bill having been sent back to conference, a conference report is coming back to the Senate with the Maybank amendment in it, which had been excluded once, and with the Long amendment in it. In other words, the Senate won its point when it stood up and said, "We are going to fight on the basis of principle. We are going to fight on the basis of the yea-and-nay votes, which have shown a majority in support of these principles."

As I have said before, there is nothing sacred about a conference report. Needless to say, at times conference reports involve compromises. There are many compromises in the conference report which came back on the Continental Shelf bill. But every time we have an opportunity to vote on a bill which involves a substantive issue, such as the Hill amendment on education, I think we ought to make every effort humanly possible to maintain our point and to enact the program for which we, as Members of the Senate, voted by a substantial majority.

I have nothing further to add. I express my hope that we shall maintain the Hill amendment. People all over the United States have supported this amendment. I know of no amendment to any bill which has had such wide support throughout the length and breadth of the land, among the rank and file of

the American people. The people of the Nation are concerned about our schools; and they have a right to be, because schools are close to their children and their homes.

It is not sufficient to say that we shall get around to this problem at some later date. Proposals for Federal aid to education have been under consideration in the Congress of the United States time after time. As the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] appropriately noted, there has not been a vote in the House of Representatives in recent years on the question of Federal aid to education of any kind. The question was bottled up in committee. Committees in Congress are mortuaries the like of which man has never known. There are many dead legislative bodies in committees. All the Senator from Tennessee is asking is that one of these forlorn souls shall have a chance to see the light of day and come to the floor of the House of Representatives and the floor of the Senate to be voted upon as legislation.

It is not sufficient to say that a measure has been referred to a committee. That is like saying that one goes to a railroad station, but he does not necessarily board the train. What we are interested in is results.

The Senator from Tennessee has made an argument which has not been set aside by any factual statement or any evidence to the contrary. I hope the Senate will insist upon its position, and that the Hill amendment will be retained in the conference report.

Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Overflowing Schools," and an article entitled "School Plight Studied," from the St. Paul Dispatch of July 7 issue of the same paper.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

OVERFLOWING SCHOOLS

One more concise summary of the plight of America's public schools has been made, this time at the Duluth branch of the University of Minnesota by Bernard A. Dawson, director of rural service for the National Education Association.

About a million additional children are being added to the school population each year, now and in the years through 1960. Not nearly enough teachers are being trained to take charge of the necessary new classrooms—and there are not nearly enough classrooms in which to put the children. Such is the situation of the public schools across the country.

A minimum of 100,000 new elementary schoolteachers will be needed each year through 1960, Mr. Dawson reports, and at least 50,000 new high-school teachers. Last year only 32,000 new elementary teachers were graduated from institutions of higher learning. There were 65,000 potential high-school teachers graduated but many of them went into elementary teaching or not into teaching at all.

School buildings containing 325,280 instruction rooms need to be built to bring the Nation's school system up to date on fulfilling enrollment needs and meeting minimum standards, Mr. Dawson says. The buildings would cost \$10 billion, of which local districts could supply only half under present bonding laws. That leaves a \$5 billion building fund shortage, without taking into ac-

count additional rooms needed in the next few years for the pyramiding enrollment.

Mr. Dawson recommends higher salaries for teachers and proper community appreciation of their status as means of enticing more young people into what should be regarded as a highly desirable profession. He sees no answer to the school-building crisis but eventual Federal grants in aid. And he appeals to citizens generally and to parents in particular to give support to school boards and educators who are trying to prevent a threatened deterioration of American public education.

SCHOOLS PLIGHT STUDIED

DULUTH.—Three factors have caused the current "plight" of public schools in the United States, a convocation of the University of Minnesota, Duluth branch, was informed today.

They are given as a shortage of qualified teachers, lack of adequate buildings and other physical facilities and unwarranted attacks on the character and integrity of the public school system and the persons in charge of it.

The convocation speaker, Howard A. Dawson of Washington, D. C., director of rural service for the National Education Association, declared that only a political upheaval which will clean out obstructionists and antisocial politicians at every level of Government can correct the situation.

Mr. Dawson called on young GI's and their wives to "kick out" these politicians and see to it that the people's government serves properly "the need of the youngest generation for schools, health facilities, and safety, at least, of life and limb."

He said such an upheaval may not come until "we have one or more major catastrophes resulting in the death or maiming of several scores of children."

Criticizing the qualifications of some teachers and housing conditions in some schools, Mr. Dawson added vehemently: "The schoolhouses are bursting at the seams and many schoolrooms have only baby sitters and policemen not teachers."

He called on parents, especially mothers, to stimulate the emotional drive necessary to generate public action for new school buildings and improvements, through local taxes and bond issues supplemented by State appropriations for grants to localities.

Among recommendations for relieving the teacher shortage he urged higher salaries, reduction in teacher load in the classrooms, a more democratic attitude toward teachers and more acceptance of teachers in the life of the community, organization of teacher preparatory classes in high schools and encouraging ablest students to enter them.

Then directing a blast at criticsisms which he said aim to destroy public confidence in those who control the school system, Mr. Dawson concluded:

"The public should stop using the public schools as a whipping boy for every frustration that arises in American life. The current vicious attacks on the integrity of the schools discourages young people from entering the teaching profession."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. KUCHEL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Bridges	Case
Anderson	Bush	Chavez
Barrett	Butler, Md.	Clements
Beall	Butler, Nebr.	Cooper
Bennett	Capehart	Cordon
Bricker	Carlson	Daniel

Dirksen	Jackson	Morse
Douglas	Jenner	Mundt
Dworshak	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Ellender	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Ferguson	Kefauver	Payne
Flanders	Kennedy	Potter
Frear	Kilgore	Purtell
Fulbright	Knowland	Robertson
Gillette	Kuchel	Russell
Goldwater	Langer	Saltonstall
Gore	Lehman	Schoeppel
Green	Lennon	Smathers
Griswold	Long	Smith, Maine
Hayden	Magnuson	Smith, N. J.
Hendrickson	Malone	Sparkman
Hennings	Mansfield	Stennis
Hickenlooper	Martin	Symington
Hill	Maybank	Thye
Hoyer	McCarran	Watkins
Holland	McCarthy	Welker
Humphrey	McClellan	Williams
Hunt	Millikin	
Ives	Monroney	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to reiterate what I believe to be the pertinent issue in the debate. It is a question of whether the Senate will adhere to the proposal which it adopted after considerable deliberation. The Hill amendment was offered as an amendment to two bills, the original, so-called tidelands bill and the Continental Shelf bill. It is my feeling that after all that labor and work, and after all the dedication and effort and conscientious activity that went into accomplishing the Hill amendment, we should sustain it on the conference report.

I firmly believe that if we lose this opportunity, we will not have a similar one for a long time to come. I would hope that we would not make that tragic mistake. It has taken us 3 years to get the amendment adopted, and I can safely predict that if we lose it now, it will take an equal length of time to retrieve it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it not true that it would take only an hour in the House of Representatives to determine how the House feels about the amendment, and in that way we would know what the situation is?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. It would take only an hour for the House of Representatives to decide the issue. Then we would have an opportunity at least to know the view of the House of Representatives, not merely the view of the members of the conference committee.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to withhold it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I make the point of order that no business has been transacted since the last quorum call. I realize it is a technical matter, and any Senator could find some excuse for making it possible to have a quorum call. Unless a Senator wishes to undertake some dilatory tactics, I suggest we vote on the conference report. I inquire of the Chair what business has been transacted since the last quorum call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained. No business has been transacted.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will accept the conference report. As was pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the conferees have brought back practically the whole Senate bill with the exception of one amendment. As a practical matter, if we were to send the report back to conference, and if it were rejected by the House, it would be merely an empty gesture. But we might end up with no Continental Shelf bill whatsoever enacted into law.

Under those circumstances it seems to me that in what I hope will be the closing days, at least of this session, the logical and the sensible thing for the Senate to do is to adopt the conference report.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I was one of the conferees on this measure. I simply wish to say that the conferees held 4 or 5 meetings. The Senate conferees worked diligently and tried to reach agreement. The House conferees, by an obvious position of 6 to 1, refused to take the matter back to the House of Representatives. Finally a majority of the Senate conferees had to ask themselves the question, "Shall we allow the wealth in the outer Continental Shelf to go unproduced, and put this matter in a condition of stalemate; or shall we bring the matter back to the Senate for decision?"

I am thoroughly convinced that nothing can be done to change the viewpoint of the House conferees.

So, Mr. President, I suggest that the conference report be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays and they were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is unavoidably detained on official business attending a meeting to extend price supports for light-weight wheat as the result of the rust situation in North Dakota. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is absent because of a death in his family, and if present would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—45

Barrett	Butler, Nebr.	Dworshak
Beall	Capehart	Eastland
Bennett	Carlson	Ellender
Bricker	Case	Ferguson
Bridges	Cordon	Flanders
Bush	Daniel	Goldwater
Butler, Md.	Dirksen	Griswold

Hendrickson	Long	Robertson
Hickenlooper	Malone	Saltonstall
Hoyer	Martin	Schoeppel
Holland	McCarthy	Smith, N. J.
Jenner	Millikin	Thye
Knowland	Payne	Watkins
Kuchel	Potter	Welker
Lennon	Purtell	Williams

NAYS—43

Aiken	Hunt	McClellan
Anderson	Ives	Monroney
Chavez	Jackson	Morse
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Mundt
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Frear	Kefauver	Pastore
Fulbright	Kennedy	Russell
Gillette	Kilgore	Smathers
Gore	Langer	Smith, Maine
Green	Lehman	Sparkman
Hayden	Magnuson	Stennis
Hennings	Mansfield	Symington
Hill	Maybank	
Humphrey	McCarran	

NOT VOTING—7

Byrd	Kerr	Young
Duff	Taft	
George	Wiley	

So the report was agreed to.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

STATEMENT ON NOMINATIONS REPORTED BY FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, this afternoon there was reported to the Executive Calendar of the Senate a list of routine nominations to the Foreign Service. In order that the recommendations of the Committee on Foreign Relations may be understood with respect to these nominations I submit for the Record, on behalf of the chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], a brief statement about the nominations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Earlier this afternoon the Foreign Relations Committee reported to the Senate a number of nominations in the Foreign Service of the United States. It will be noted that this list varies in certain respects from that transmitted to the Senate on July 22 by President Eisenhower. I should like to have the record show why the committee feels justified in deleting some 31 names from the original list.

There are three categories of officers involved. The first category of individuals concerns officers promoted from one grade to another within the Foreign Service. The second consists of members of the Foreign Service who have received new titles so that they may perform additional functions. The third consists of individuals who are being recommended for permanent appointments in the Foreign Service, either by way of transfer from the Foreign Service reserve or from outside the service.

In going over the list before us, the committee found that some of the nominees had not had a full FBI field investigation, although in every case some security check had been made—either by the Office of Se-

curity of the Department of State or by the FBI, or both. The committee believed it unwise, however, to blanket into the service now, on a permanent basis, those individuals who have not received a security clearance in accordance with the new standards which the executive branch is putting into effect.

We recommend, therefore, that 31 names in the third category which I referred to above—all of them individuals transferring laterally from the Foreign Service Reserve to the Foreign Service—be withheld until the Congress reconvenes in January. During the intervening period, a full FBI field investigation can be completed and final approval can be given by the Senate. So far as categories 1 and 2 are concerned—consisting of individuals already permanent members of the Foreign Service—the committee believes it appropriate to grant the changes in status that have been requested.

One additional comment should be made about the third category. This includes a number of new appointments to class 6 of the Foreign Service. Since these appointments are of a probationary character, and are not yet permanent in nature, the committee recommends that they be approved at this time with the understanding that full field investigations will be completed as soon as practicable.

In this connection, I want to make it perfectly clear that the committee has no reason whatsoever to doubt the loyalty of any of the persons concerned. It is our understanding that these individuals may serve in their posts as members of the Foreign Service Reserve without any loss of pay. Personally, I hope they will understand fully the reason for the committee's recommendation so that they may carry on their work without being concerned about their future status.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, we next have the conference report on the rubber plants disposal bill, which I understand was agreed to in conference this afternoon. Following that we shall have a call of the calendar of bills to which there is no objection, from order No. 647 through order No. 690.

DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED RUBBER-PRODUCING FACILITIES; CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5728) to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read by the legislative clerk.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask whether the conference report was signed by all the members of the conference.

Mr. CAPEHART. It has been so signed.

Mr. MAYBANK. May I inquire whether the Long amendment was retained?

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me first say the report was unanimously agreed to by all the conferees, both the conferees on the part of the Senate and the House managers. The House has already agreed to the report. I sincerely urge the Senate to agree to the conference report.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator tell the Senate just what was agreed to?

Mr. CAPEHART. The question is, What did we agree to? I suppose a better way to put it would be, What was in disagreement? The matters in disagreement were the Maybank amendment and the Long amendment. The Long amendment was added to the bill on the floor of the Senate. The House receded in respect to the Maybank amendment. In respect to the Long amendment, the conferees added a new clause. I shall be very glad to explain the new clause, if any Senator would like to have me do so.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The clause which the Senator has in mind had to do with the fact that if a person bid for a certain type of plant, and needed another one to go with it, he could withdraw, if part of his bid was rejected. Is not that correct?

Mr. CAPEHART. What the conferees did was to add a new section, to follow section 24. In reality, it is an amendment to the Long amendment. However, it was handled as a new section. The Senator will remember that during the debate on the floor of the Senate we constantly kept before us the fact that we wanted to dispose of a complete industry and also wanted to protect the industry in regard to the antitrust laws, to make sure that we would have a free competitive system, and to assure ourselves that we would be able to get a fair price. It was therefore necessary to sell it as a whole. The Long amendment gave the Congress the right to reject any sale if in its opinion it was not a good sale. The Senator will remember that I objected very strenuously to the amendment, and the argument on the floor of the Senate lasted for about 2 hours.

The new clause which has been agreed to by the conferees retains the Long amendment, as written by the able Senator from Louisiana, and agreed to by the Senate. However, the new clause says that if the Congress rejects an individual sale, then all other bidders for all the other facilities have a right, within 30 days, if they so desire, to withdraw their bids. Also, the new section states that Congress, under certain circumstances, may reject a sale, regardless of how bad

or how good it may think the sale to be, if, by permitting the sale or sales, the total production of the synthetic rubber industry would be reduced to less than 500,000 tons. A sale can be rejected, but the whole disposal plan would be rejected. The idea of that is to make certain that in disposing of an industry, we leave sufficient production potential to supply the small producers of America, who otherwise might be in such a situation that they could not make sufficient synthetic rubber to keep thousands of users, meaning manufacturers and processors, supplied with rubber.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I believe what was agreed to is a fair qualification in regard to the amendment I offered. I understand that it was designed to make the amendment more workable. I congratulate the chairman of the conference upon the work he has done in this matter, and I believe the conference report should certainly be adopted.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As I remember the bill the Senate sent to conference, the Government retained one plant. Is that correct?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; the Government retains one test laboratory, located at Akron, Ohio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the call of the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 647, where we left off the last time, through Calendar No. 690, with the addition of the three bills which were moved over from the last calendar call, namely, Calendar Nos. 617, 620, and 645.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield in order to take up two conference reports?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

STATUS OF CERTAIN MINING CLAIMS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1397) to clarify the status of mining claims in areas held under an oil and gas prospecting permit or lease and to encourage the exploration and development of fissionable source minerals, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read by the Legislative Clerk.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 30, 1953, p. 10561, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF MINERAL-LEASING LAWS RELATING TO PIPELINES PASSING THROUGH PUBLIC DOMAIN—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2220) to amend the mineral-leasing laws with respect to their application in the case of pipelines passing through the public domain, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read by the Legislative Clerk.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 30, 1953, p. 10561, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 98) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to liquidate the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration.

The message also announced that the House had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1105) to incorporate the National Safety Council, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. FEIGHAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2249) to enable the President, during the period ending March 15, 1954, to furnish to peoples friendly to the United States emergency assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HOPE, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. COOLEY, and Mr. POAGE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5728) to authorize the disposal

of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities, and for other purposes.

INCREASE IN STATUTORY DEBT LIMIT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 220)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Prior to the call of the calendar, the Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which the clerk will read.

The Legislative Clerk read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

The administration in cooperation with the Congress has moved promptly and vigorously to reduce earlier recommendations for appropriations for the fiscal year 1953-54 by about \$13 billion and to reduce the prospective deficit by about one-half.

However, operations for the fiscal year just ended have produced a deficit of \$9.4 billion. In addition, the Government on June 30 was faced with \$81 billion of appropriations authorizing expenditures for which the money must be provided as the bills are presented from time to time.

Despite our joint vigorous efforts to reduce expenditures, it is inevitable that the public debt will undergo some further increase.

On June 30 last the public debt was \$266 billion. To meet the Government's cash requirements for this current quarter it was necessary to borrow over \$6 billion in July, bringing the national debt now to over \$272 billion. To meet necessary expenditures and to maintain a safe working balance of funds it will be necessary to borrow more money before the next session of the Congress. This will carry the debt above the present legal limit of \$275 billion.

Under present circumstances, the existing statutory debt limit is so restrictive that it does not allow the financial operating leeway necessary to conduct the Government's fiscal affairs effectively. This is specific with respect to the seasonal variations of Federal receipts and disbursements and also in view of the uncertainty as to the future income and expenditure levels.

I must, therefore, request of the Congress legislation raising the statutory debt limit. It is my recommendation that the limit should be increased to \$290 billion.

DWIGHT EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 30, 1953.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The message will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent order, the clerk will proceed to call the bills on the calendar.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 110) favoring the granting of the

status of permanent residence to certain aliens was announced as first in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 5, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "A-5772189" and insert "A-6772189," and on page 11, after line 5, to insert:

A-6501662, Berkowic, Mikulas.
A-7053562, Denes, Emery (Imre).
A-7053561, Denes, Hedwig Alice.
A-7415208, Denes, Istvan (Steven).
A-7415209, Denes, John.
A-7415207, Denes, Marietta Catherine.
A-7351567, Devay, Bela.
A-7351568, Devay, Jenő.
A-7351569, Devay, Laura.
A-7351565, Devay, Livia.
A-7351566, Devay, Marianne.
A-7056844, Fisman, Igor.
A-7134270, Goldberg, Jankiel.
A-7525881, Ho, Fifi Lee Yee Fang Sun.
A-0923852, Ho, Nelson Hual Tsu.
A-7267739, Mina, Abed Hanna.
A-6903760, Morrissey, Suzanne Rath.
A-6588565, Raby, Tawfik Meir.
A-6851589, Tong, Robert Yui-Peng.
A-6739348, Wang, Bobby.
A-6739355, Wang, Jeanett Kwang Chien.
A-6739347, Wang, Paul.
A-6739349, Wang, Peter.
A-6450107, Wang, Te Chi C.
A-7873138, Wu, Jun Fei or Jane Wu.
A-7873131, Wu, Rowena Lee.
A-7873130, Wu, Yi-Min.
A-6847822, Yang, Meng-Chung alias James Meng-Chung Yang.
A-7069212, Zehrer, Helen.

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

EMPLOYEES OF CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2038) to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone government, was announced as first in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask that the bills go over. I talked to the Chairman of the Civil Service Committee and since a Commission has been established to make a study of retirement legislation, I think both the bills should wait for their report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Did the Senator mention another bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. This bill and Calendar 681, Senate bill 1688, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended. I ask that they both go over to the next call of the calendar.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, is the Senator from Delaware asking that they go to the foot of the calendar?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am asking that they go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2231) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act relating to debt claims was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

COMPENSATION TO SHOSHONE AND ARAPAHOE INDIANS FOR CERTAIN LANDS OF THE RIVERTON RECLAMATION PROJECT

The bill (H. R. 4483) to provide compensation to the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes of Indians for certain lands of the Riverton Reclamation Project within added portion of the Wind River Indian Reservation, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to compensate the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes on the Riverton Project in Wyoming for 160,500 acres of land. I may say that in 1904 the Indians ceded to the United States 322,000 acres of land under the express condition that when the lands were sold and disposed of, the tribes would be paid for the lands. The price was set for a period of 8 years. Nearly 50 years have elapsed, and during that time the Bureau of Reclamation built the Riverton Project, consisting of approximately 100,000 acres of irrigable lands. The lands within the project and close to the project total 161,500 acres. Approximately 7,500 acres are lands upon which the Pilot Butte Reservoir and the Ocean Lake Reservoir, both of which furnish water for the project, are located. Approximately 2 years ago the Bureau of Reclamation and the tribes, through their counsel, entered into negotiations for the purpose of settling this obligation incurred nearly 50 years ago.

In addition to the purchase of lands which were priced from \$6 to \$10 an acre, the tribes are also to be compensated for gravel which was taken from canals built on their lands, for telephone lines erected on their lands, and for other uses of the lands over that period.

An agreement was reached between the tribes and the Bureau of Reclamation, and the bill was drafted. The bill has the unanimous support of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and has the approval of the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. How much will the Indians get?

Mr. BARRETT. They will get \$1,009,500. Some of the lands are irrigable lands. It is provided that the lands shall be sold at no less than \$6.25 an acre, which will compensate the Bureau for the expenditures.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4483), which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that the amendments have previously been agreed to.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. IRMA BENJAMIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 171) for the relief of Mrs. Irma Benjamin which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee" to strike out "and head tax", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Irma Benjamin shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INSUN LEE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 179) for the relief of Insun Lee which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "tax.", to insert "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Insun Lee shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FELIX S. SCHORR AND HIS WIFE, LILLY ELIZABETH SCHORR

The bill (S. 303) for the relief of Felix S. Schorr and his wife, Lilly Elizabeth Schorr, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Felix S. Schorr, and his wife, Lilly Elizabeth Schorr, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the

enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

FILOLAOS ISOLAKIS AND HIS WIFE, VASSILIKI ISOLAKIS

The bill (S. 308) for the relief of Filolaos Isolakis and his wife, Vassiliki Isolakis, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Filolaos Isolakis and his wife, Vassiliki Isolakis, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

INGER LARSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 354) for the relief of Inger Larson, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 4, after the name "Inger", to strike out "Larson" and insert "Larsson", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Inger Larsson shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Inger Larsson."

HORST F. W. DITTMAR AND HEINZ-ERIK DITTMAR

The bill (S. 506) for the relief of Horst F. W. Dittmar and Heinz-Erik Dittmar was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Horst F. W. Dittmar and Heinz-Erik Dittmar shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

GEORGE P. KHOURI

The bill (S. 743) for the relief of George P. Khouri was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, George P. Khouri shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

SILVA GALJEVSCEK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1038) for the relief of Silva Galjevscek which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Silva Galjevscek shall be held and considered to be the minor child of her parents, Franz and Leopolda Galjevscek, lawful permanent residents of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPHINE MARIA RISS FANG

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1050) for the relief of Josephine Maria Riss Fang which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "and head tax", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Josephine Maria Riss Fang shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANTHONY N. GORAIEB

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1954) for the relief of Anthony N. Goraieb which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anthony N. Goraieb shall be considered to have been registered on the waiting list for intending immigrants for the quota for Lebanon as of April 17, 1945, the date on which American consular officers abroad were authorized to resume registration of intending immigrants.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VALDA CIMERMANIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1969) for the relief of Valda Cimermanis which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Valda Cimermanis shall be held and considered to be the minor child of her parents, Milda and Vilis Cimermanis, lawful permanent residents of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

YUSUF (UASH) LAZAR

The bill (H. R. 786) for the relief of Yusuf (Uash) Lazar was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES H. LIN (ALSO KNOWN AS LIN CHAO HSI)

The bill (H. R. 960) for the relief of Charles H. Lin (also known as Lin Chao Hsi) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IRENE PROIOS (NEE VAGIANOS)

The bill (H. R. 1695) for the relief of Irene Proios (nee Vagianos) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. MANOUSOS A. PETROHELOS

The bill (H. R. 1754) for the relief of Dr. Manousos A. Petrohelos was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHIYOKO MIKI TOMONO

The bill (H. R. 2187) for the relief of Chiyoko Miki Tomono was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MATSUE HASHIMOTO

The bill (H. R. 2413) for the relief of Matsue Hashimoto was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LAURI ALLAN Torni

The bill (H. R. 2604) for the relief of Lauri Allan Torni was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PANAGIOTES G. KARRAS

The bill (H. R. 3831) for the relief of Panagiotis G. Karras was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELEONORE FRIEDRICH McANELLY

The bill (H. R. 4424) for the relief of Eleonore Friedrich McAnelly was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HORMOZ MAHMOUD

The bill (H. R. 4833) for the relief of Hormoz Mahmoud was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CARMELA DAINO DAVENIA

The bill (H. R. 2603) for the relief of Carmela Daino Davenia was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. HAMDI AKAR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3396) for the relief of Dr. Hamdi Akar which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT

The bill (H. R. 6039) to amend section 47c of the National Defense Act was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELECTION OF CERTAIN CONTINGENCY OPTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5304) to permit members of the uniformed services to elect certain contingency options, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, on page 2, line 9, after the word "service", to insert "or member of a reserve component of a uniformed service, who has completed twenty satisfactory years in his uniformed service, as defined in section 302 of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948"; in line 16, after the word "awarded", to strike out "retired" and insert "retired,"; on page 5, line 17, after the word "status", to insert "on the effective date of this act"; in line 18, after the word "has", to strike out "heretofore" and insert "theretofore"; in line 23, after the word "a", to strike out "uniform" and insert "uniformed"; on page 7, line 2, after the word "marriage", to insert "death"; in line 15, after the word "marriage", to insert "death"; on page 8, line 19, after

"per annum", to insert "or such other interest rate as the Secretary of the Treasury, after considering the average yield during the preceding six months on outstanding marketable long-term obligations of the United States, may specify by August 1 of any year as applicable for the succeeding calendar year"; on page 10, line 2, after the word "Department", to strike out "Determinations and certifications under this act shall not be subject to review by any administrative or accounting officer of the Government"; in line 14, after the word "concerned", to insert "and the Comptroller General of the United States"; after line 18, to strike out:

(c) No certifying or disbursing officer shall be held liable for any amount erroneously certified or paid by him pursuant to this act, unless, in the judgment of the head of the department concerned, such erroneous certification or payment is the result of his negligence or his intent to defraud.

And on page 12, line 5, after "Sec. 12.", to strike out "There are hereby authorized to be permanently appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act." and insert "The payments authorized to be made under this act shall be made out of applicable current appropriations which are made available for that purpose."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD just prior to its passage, an explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill permits retired officers and enlisted men to elect to take a reduction in their monthly retirement pay check so that the surviving widow or children may receive an annuity in case the retired person should die. Under the terms of the bill the plan is completely optional—it is not compulsory. It applies to officers and enlisted men, regular and reservists alike.

The Federal Government makes no contribution toward the annuity. Except for a very minor administrative cost, the bill involves no additional expense to the Federal Government.

On July 23, the Armed Services Committee heard a full panel of witnesses on the bill. The hearings have been printed and have been available to the Senate since July 27. Copies are available on the floor of the Senate at the present time. The Senate report contains a complete analysis of the major provisions of the bill, as well as a detailed analysis of each section of the bill.

Reports were requested from the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Civil Service Commission. They are printed in full in the committee report, beginning on page 14. These departments or agencies supported the bill, subject to several amendments recommended by the General Accounting Office and the Bureau of the Budget. All of the amendments suggested by the General Accounting Office have been incorporated in the bill. One amendment suggested by the Bureau of the Budget was also adopted. The committee rejected a second amendment by the Bureau of the Budget, but this action should not be construed as in any

way implying that the Bureau of the Budget opposes the bill in its present form.

Congressman COLE, of New York, the author of the bill in the House Committee on Armed Services, appeared before the Senate committee at the committee's invitation. Congressman COLE pointed out, among other things, that he and Congressman KILDAY, of Texas, have been working on this bill in subcommittee since 1947. I mention that, Mr. President, to emphasize that the bill is one which has had the most lengthy and detailed consideration.

Defense Department witnesses, headed by Admiral Fechteler, appeared in support of the bill.

The bill is acceptable to the Association of Life Insurance Companies and to the Association of Life Insurance Agents and Underwriters. The two associations filed letters with the committee endorsing the bill. These letters are printed in full in the committee hearings on page 29. These associations pointed out that their own actuaries approved the actuarial features of the bill.

The chief actuary of the Social Security Administration appeared as a technical adviser to the Armed Services Committee at the request of the chairman, and stated that the actuarial features are sound.

It is of special significance to note that the distinguished chairman of the committee on retirement policy, Mr. H. Elliot Kaplan, fully endorses the bill and recommends its prompt enactment. I would invite special attention to Mr. Kaplan's letter, which appears on the last page of the report.

To summarize, the bill, with all the recommended amendments except one to section II, has the approval of the Government departments and the insurance interests. It has every guarantee of actuarial soundness, and in its amended form has the full approval of the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE AND NARCOTIC DRUGS IMPORT AND EXPORT ACT

The bill (H. R. 5561) to amend the Internal Revenue Code and the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act so as to provide that certain drugs which are or may be chemically synthesized shall be included within the classification of narcotic drugs was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION TO TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE RELATING TO NARCOTICS

The bill (H. R. 5257) to extend to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to narcotics was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2451) to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to preference accorded in Federal employment to disabled veterans, and for other purposes, which had been reported from

the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with amendments, on page 2, line 2, after the word "messengers", to insert "and," and in the same line, after the word "and" insert "in examinations held prior to December 31, 1954, for positions of", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 3 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. In all examinations to determine the qualifications of applicants for entrance into the service 10 points shall be added to the earned ratings of those persons included under section 2 (1), (2), (3), and (5), and 5 points shall be added to the earned ratings of those persons included under section 2 (4) and (6), who have received a passing grade. In examinations for positions of guards, elevator operators, messengers, and custodians, and in examinations held prior to December 31, 1954, for positions of apprentices, competition shall be restricted to persons entitled to preference under this act as long as persons entitled to preference are available. In examinations for such positions as may from time to time be determined by the President, competition shall be restricted, during the period beginning with the effective date of this act and ending with the expiration of the authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces under the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to persons entitled to preference under this act."

(b) Section 7 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. The names of preference eligibles who have received a passing grade shall be entered on the appropriate registers or lists of eligibles in accordance with their respective augmented ratings, and the name of a preference eligible shall be entered ahead of all others having the same rating: *Provided*, That except for positions in the professional and scientific services in grade 9 or higher of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, the names of all qualified preference eligibles who have a compensable service-connected disability of 10 percent or more, and who are entitled to 10 points in addition to their earned ratings, shall be placed at the top of the appropriate civil-service register or employment list, in accordance with their respective augmented ratings."

SEC. 2. The first proviso in section 8 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 is amended by striking out the word "considered" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "shall be complied with."

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall be construed to take away from any preference eligible who files an application before the date on which this act takes effect any preference in connection with such application which he would have been entitled to under provisions of law in effect immediately prior to such date.

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on the 60th day after the date of its enactment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the purpose is by amendment to strengthen the position of the veteran in the competitive civil-service without weakening the law in any respect.

To do this it contains two major accomplishments which will eliminate much of the criticism that has been directed against the veterans' preference as it now operates. First, it provides that a veteran must receive a passing grade in his examination before he may receive preferred treatment. Second, it provides that before an eligible who is entitled to the 10 points veterans'

preference may go to the top of the register ahead of all candidates, he must have compensable disability of 10 percent or more. Under the present law a veteran may make a below-standard grade and through his preference be placed on an eligible register. This has worked a disadvantage to veterans as a group inasmuch as the preference has elevated unqualified veterans, by set standards, to civil-service eligible lists thereby placing persons who are not fully qualified to perform the work for which the register was maintained in direct competition with those persons who have met the standard requirements.

Under the present law disabled veterans, irrespective of the degree of their disability, are entitled to an extra advantage of "floating" to the top of the register ahead of all other eligibles. This includes not only those veterans who are significantly disabled but also those who have a small degree of service-connected disability and irrespective of whether they are entitled to receive compensation for such and includes certain wives, widows, and mothers of veterans. The one exception to this is a provision that applies to examinations for positions of professional and scientific services paying in excess of \$3,000 a year or more. This bill ties the exception clause to the Classification Act of 1949 in the rating of a GS-9 or above and provides that before a veteran who is entitled to a 10-point preference be given the extra advantage of "floating" to the top of the register above all other eligibles he must have had a service-connected disability of 10 percent or more. This does not deprive any disabled veteran of his 10-point preference but merely states that he must have a 10-percent disability before he can receive the extra advantage of "floating" to the top of the eligible register.

The bill extends the provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 which restricts examinations for positions of guards, elevator operators, messengers, and custodians to eligibles entitled to preference between the effective date of this act and the end of the expiration of the authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces under the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended.

Further, in the light of the need to give the maximum opportunities to the boys now returning from the Korean conflict it includes in this provision apprentices who take examinations for such prior to December 31, 1954.

The second section of the bill by a change in the wording will make certain that an appointing officer will take the final findings of the commission with respect to the insufficiency of his reason for passing over the veteran thus giving full consideration to the veteran in making his selection from among the three eligibles under consideration.

This act shall take effect on the 60th day after the date of its enactment.

The committee feels that this legislation will aid the departments and agencies in obtaining better qualified personnel and will strengthen the basic principles of veterans' preference in Federal employment.

Representatives of veterans' organizations, including the Disabled War Veterans, the American Legion, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, have approved the proposed legislation, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CARLSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. Do I understand correctly that the bill does not disturb the veterans' preference rights of any veterans now in Government employ?

Mr. CARLSON. It does not. It affects no one until 60 days after the enactment of the legislation.

Mr. GORE. Do I understand correctly that the object and accomplishment of the bill are to give more premium to qualifications, yet preserving veterans' rights, than is done by the present law?

Mr. CARLSON. It does that by requiring a passing grade before a veteran is placed on the rolls.

Mr. GORE. I withdraw any objection.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator for Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the bill make any distinction at all between veterans of World War I and veterans of World War II, and are veterans of Korea included?

Mr. CARLSON. They are included; in fact, the bill was written principally with veterans of Korea in mind.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that Calendar 686 (H. R. 6185) is a companion bill which passed the House and is now on the calendar. I shall ask unanimous consent that all after the enacting clause of the House bill be stricken, that the language of the Senate bill as just passed be inserted in lieu thereof, and that the House bill, as amended, be passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the House bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6185) to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to preference accorded in Federal employment to disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6185) to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to preference accorded in Federal employment to disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

Mr. CARLSON. I now move that all after the enacting clause be stricken out, and that the language of Senate bill 2451, as amended, be inserted in lieu thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kansas.

The motion was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 2451 is indefinitely postponed.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO DOCKET FEES

The bill (S. 251) to amend section 1923 (a) of title 28, United States Code, relating to docket fees was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first item listed in section 1923 (a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "\$20 on trial or final hearing (including a default judgment whether entered by the court or by the clerk) in civil, criminal, or admiralty cases, except that in cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction where the libellant recovers less than \$50 the proctor's docket fee shall be \$10."

INCOME AND ESTATE TAXES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6426) to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend the time during which certain provisions relating to income and estate taxes shall apply, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, what was done with Calendar 681, Senate bill 1688?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill went over on objection made earlier today.

T. K. LI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2462) for the relief of T. K. Li which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, T. K. Li shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1949

The bill (S. 2487) to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of this bill for the RECORD? It seems to be very important legislation?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, this bill is a very simple one, designed solely to expedite the settlement of certain claims of American citizens against Yugoslavia.

The claims arise from the nationalization of property which was carried out in Yugoslavia after World War II. We entered into an agreement with the Yugoslavs in 1948 under which Yugoslavia deposited \$17 million in the United States Treasury to be paid out to American citizens in settlement of the claims.

Subsequently, Congress passed the International Claims Settlement Act setting up the International Claims Commission in the Department of State to examine the claims and make final decisions regarding them. That act provided that the Commission's work in connection with Yugoslav claims should end by March 10, 1954. It is now obvious that the work on these claims cannot be finished by that date. As of June 30, 1953, only 508 claims had been finally decided, and 1,039 were still pending. This bill, therefore, extends the time for deciding the claims from March 10, 1954, to December 31, 1954.

The existing law also provides that 3 percent of the amount of each payment shall be deducted to cover the expenses of the Commission. Experience has shown that 3 percent is too low a figure, and the pending bill increases that to 5 percent.

Three percent of \$17 million is \$510,000, and the Commission's expenses have already amounted to approximately \$505,000. The Congress has taken the attitude—and I think rightly so—that the expenses of settling these claims should not be borne by the taxpayers but by the claimants themselves. The only alternatives, therefore, are to let the work of the Commission lapse or to increase the amount that can be deducted from each payment for administrative expenses.

The increase to 5 percent which is provided in the pending bill will make available an additional \$340,000, which should be sufficient to complete the work on the remaining claims.

It is urgent that the bill be passed at the present session of Congress, because the Commission is now without funds and its work has been interrupted. The money is lying idle in the Treasury, and if it is not paid out to the claimants who are its rightful owners, it will revert to Yugoslavia under the terms of the 1948 agreement.

I hope the Senate will pass the bill promptly.

I may add that this would not cost the American people a cent. The bill involves a percentage deduction from the amount of money which the Yugoslavs have deposited in dollars in this country to meet the claims, and this bill represents an increase from 3 percent to cover expenses to a total of 5 percent. No ex-

penses to the Treasury of the United States is involved.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The junior Senator from New Jersey thanks the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, approved March 10, 1950 (64 Stat. 12; 22 U. S. C. 1625), is hereby amended by striking out the words "four years following the effective date of this act" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1954."

Sec. 2. Section 7 (b) of such act is amended by striking out "3 percent" and substituting in lieu thereof "5 percent."

EXEMPTION OF ACTIVITIES OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION FROM STATE AND LOCAL TAXATION

The bill (S. 671) to amend section 9 (f) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 relating to the exemption of activities of the Atomic Energy Commission from State and local taxation was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy with an amendment, after line 4, to insert:

SEC. 2. This amendment shall be effective only as to tax liabilities which accrue subsequent to October 1, 1953.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 (b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof.

SEC. 2. This amendment shall be effective only as to tax liabilities which accrue subsequent to October 1, 1953.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in order to perfect the bill, I move to strike the words "subsequent to", in line 6, page 1, and insert the words "on or after."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement in connection with the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HICKENLOOPER

The purpose of section 1 of S. 671, as amended, is to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, by striking the last sentence of section 9 (b) thereof, which, as interpreted by the courts, affords to the Atomic Energy Commission and to its contractors an exemption from State and local taxation broader in scope than that generally enjoyed by all other departments and agencies of the Federal Government. The bill thus will place the Atomic Energy Commission on a basis identical to that of the

rest of the Federal Government with respect to such taxation.

Section 2 of the bill (S. 671, as amended) simply insures that the effect of this action will be prospective only; that is, it specifies that the amendment shall be effective only as to tax liabilities accruing subsequent to September 30, 1953.

I believe a brief background statement on this legislation is in order. The last sentence of section 9 (b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 reads as follows:

"The Commission, and the property, activities, and income of the Commission, are hereby expressly exempted from taxation in any manner or form by any State, county, municipality, or any subdivision thereof."

On January 7, 1952, the Supreme Court of the United States in *Carson v. Roane-Anderson Co.* held that the word "activities" may be broad enough to include what is done through independent contractors of the Commission as well as by agents of the Commission. The effect of this decision has been that contractors of the AEC, subject only to administrative interpretation by the Commission, are free of taxation by States and localities.

Thus the Atomic Energy Commission now has an exemption from State and local taxation much broader in scope than that available to the other departments and agencies of the Federal Government, which rely only upon the constitutional immunity of the Federal Government for their exemption from taxation. The Supreme Court, in *Alabama v. King and Boozer* (314 U. S. 1), established the principle that the constitutional immunity does not extend to cost-plus-fixed-fee contractors of the Federal Government, but is limited to taxes imposed directly upon the United States. Thus, the Atomic Energy Commission's contractors, by reason of the statutory exemption as interpreted by the Supreme Court, are entitled to an exemption from taxation which is not enjoyed by comparably situated contractors of other agencies and departments.

A number of States have expressed the view that section 9 (b), as interpreted in the *Roane-Anderson* decision carves out an area of exemption from State and local taxation which deprives State and local governmental units of substantial revenue, particularly in those areas in which the Atomic Energy Commission carries on large-scale activities. The governors' conference unanimously adopted a resolution at their 44th annual meeting in Houston, Tex., in 1952 requesting that the Congress enact legislation which would eliminate AEC contractors from the scope of tax immunity. A similar resolution was adopted by the National Association of Tax Administrators on June 20, 1953, in its conference at Yellowstone National Park.

Representatives of the Atomic Energy Commission have appeared before the joint committee and have expressed the view that, from the viewpoint of the Commission alone, section 9 (b) of the Atomic Energy Act should be retained in its present form. The Commission acknowledges, however, that there may be overriding considerations of policy in the field of Federal-State-local fiscal relationships, which it is not in a position to evaluate. The joint committee has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that these special considerations have been studied, and that the Bureau recommends favorable consideration of S. 671, as amended. It is the conclusion of the Bureau of the Budget that, whatever may have been the expectations when the Atomic Energy Act was adopted in 1946, there is no compelling reason to require a reservation for the AEC of greater immunity from State and local taxes than is accorded to Federal agencies and instrumentalities generally.

This bill places the Commission and its activities on the same basis, with respect to immunity from State and local taxation, as

other Federal agencies. Immunity from taxation will be by virtue of the Constitution of the United States, as interpreted by the courts.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

USE OF TRIBAL FUNDS OF UTE MOUNTAIN TRIBE OF INDIANS

The bill (H. R. 5328) to provide for the use of the tribal funds of the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation, to authorize a per capita payment out of such funds, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISTRIBUTION OF MONEYS OF DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES

The bill (H. R. 1383) to provide for distribution of moneys of deceased restricted members of the Five Civilized Tribes, not exceeding \$500, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUBMISSION OF CLAIMS OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS TO THE COURT OF CLAIMS

The bill (S. 129) to amend the act of August 31, 1935 (40 Stat. 1049) authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin to submit claims to the Court of Claims was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second proviso in section 3 of the act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1049, 1050), entitled "An act authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin to submit claims to the Court of Claims," is hereby amended by deleting "5 percent" and by inserting in lieu thereof "10 percent."

THE VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the call of the calendar.

BI-STATE PARK—KENTUCKY AND VIRGINIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 81) granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the establishment of a bi-State park by the States of Kentucky and Virginia.

MR. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

MR. KNOWLAND. What is the unfinished business before the Senate?

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business is Calendar No. 696, Senate Joint Resolution 81.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

MR. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am now prepared to move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, unless Senators wish to insert matters in the RECORD.

MR. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

MR. KNOWLAND. I yield.

MR. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota is very much interested in the next bill on the calendar, Calendar No. 691, a bill to confer jurisdiction on the States of California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, and Wisconsin with respect to criminal offenses and civil causes of action committed or arising on Indian reservations within such States, and for other purposes. When is that bill likely to be called up?

MR. KNOWLAND. I will say for the information of the Senator, for the benefit of the two calendar committees, and of other Members of the Senate, that we shall have possibly two calendar calls tomorrow. I expect to complete the call from the point where we discontinued today to the end of the printed calendar of today on the first call. Then, depending on what our calendar looks like tomorrow, and whether or not the committee reports and bills are available—and I will consult with the two calendar committees—at the end of the day we may have a second calendar call. That may depend upon whether, in view of the developments tomorrow, we are likely to be still in session next week or not.

MR. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

MR. KNOWLAND. I yield.

MR. HENDRICKSON. I assume that the distinguished acting majority leader would not call any bills on the calendar if the proper information were not available to the respective calendar committees.

MR. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct. If a bill were to be passed on the call of the calendar, even though it had been reported from a committee, without either the bill or the printed report being available, the circumstances would have to be most unusual.

MR. HENDRICKSON. I thank the distinguished Senator.

MR. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

MR. KNOWLAND. I yield.

MR. SMATHERS. Has the acting majority leader given up as his target date for adjournment midnight July 31?

MR. KNOWLAND. All I can say to the distinguished Senator from Florida is that the schedule which I had outlined as of last night can be completed, in my judgment, and we can coast into adjournment easily by tomorrow night, probably without even having to remain in session until midnight. However, in view of the developments of this morning, I wish to reserve judgment as to what the hour of adjournment or the date of adjournment may be.

MR. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

MR. KNOWLAND. I yield.

MR. GORE. Would the Senator welcome any assistance in arriving at a decision?

MR. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that I have notified the Secretary of State that in my judgment I shall not be able to leave with him on either Saturday or Sunday. We must reserve judgment as to what the situation may be next week.

VALIDITY OF THE SUBMERGED LANDS ACT

MR. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the attorney general of the State of Kansas has sent me a copy of a telegram which he addressed to the attorney general of the State of Texas. The correspondence concerns the action filed by the State of Arkansas, attacking the validity of the so-called tidelands bill recently enacted by the Congress.

This subject is so important, and the telegram to which I refer is so cogent, that I believe all Members of the Senate will be interested. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the letter and telegram to which I refer may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF KANSAS,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Topeka, July 17, 1953.

HON. PAT McCARRAN,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McCARRAN: Enclosed is a copy of a telegram for your information which I sent to the Honorable John Ben Shepperd, attorney general of Texas, on July 13.

In view of the language used in the opinion in *United States v. California*, it would seem that neither the Federal courts nor agencies of the Federal Government can now legally litigate the tidelands bill on a constitutional basis.

This suit appears to have about as much basis either morally or legally, as if the State of Kansas were to file suit against the State of Montana, claiming its share of the undiscovered gold in the Rocky Mountains in that State. No doubt other suits will follow against the States of Louisiana and Texas. It seems to me that the advocates and supporters of the tidelands bill should commence now to win the battle of public opinion against the purposes of this suit.

I wish to assure you of my continued support and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,
HAROLD R. FATZER,
Attorney General.

TOPEKA, KANS., July 13, 1953.

HON. JOHN BEN SHEPPERD,
Attorney General of Texas,
Austin, Tex.:

I am advised that the State of Arkansas has filed suit in the Federal district court of the District of Columbia, against Secretary of the Interior McKay, Secretary of Navy Anderson, and Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, seeking an adjudication of the invalidity of H. R. 4198, the tidelands bill, confirming and establishing the title of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries, recently passed Congress by overwhelming vote and signed by President Eisenhower. The tidelands bill was sponsored by the National Association of Attorneys General and since 1947 this association has gone on record by overwhelming vote at each annual convention as favoring the restoring of title to all submerged lands within historic boundaries of each of the several States. For over 150 years prior to decision of *U. S. v. California* in 1946, the Supreme Court of the United States had consistently held that title to all submerged lands within State boundaries was owned outright by each State. In the *California* case the Court held that tidelands within the boundaries of California were not owned by the State and that the United

States has paramount powers and rights therein. This decision overruled precedent 150 years old, and made it necessary that Congress determine and declare the ownership of submerged lands.

In the California case the Supreme Court of the United States said: "Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution (of the United States) vests in Congress 'power to dispose of and to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory of other property belonging to the United States.' We have said that the constitutional power of Congress in this respect is without limitation. (Citations omitted.) Thus neither the courts nor the executive agencies could proceed contrary to an act of Congress in this congressional area of national power."

It appears obvious that since the Supreme Court of the United States has said that neither the Federal courts nor the executive agencies of the Federal Government may proceed contrary to an act of Congress with respect to legislation enacted by it pertaining to territory or property belonging to the United States, the filing of this suit was motivated purely by political reasons and to rehash a controversy which has been settled by the representatives of all the people in the Congress of the United States.

HAROLD R. FATZER,
Attorney General of Kansas.

SALARY INCREASES FOR FEDERAL JUDGES AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a number of editorials, printed in various newspapers across the country, relating to my bill. S. 1663, to provide salary increases for Federal judges and Members of Congress. These editorials are uniformly favorable to the bill. Included in this group are editorials printed in newspapers in New Orleans, La., Belleville, Ill., Wausau, Wis., Hutchinson and Newton, Kans., Minneapolis, Minn., St. Louis, Mo., Kansas City, Mo., Des Moines and Sioux City, Iowa, Tiffin, Ohio, Elkhart, Ind., Fort Atkinson, Wis., and Fairmont, Minn.

Senators will recall that 2 or 3 weeks ago I asked leave to have a number of similar editorials printed in the RECORD, as an indication of the reaction which this bill is causing. Today, I ask unanimous consent that these editorials to which I have just referred may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Orleans States of June 11, 1953]

SALARY BILL

Members of Congress are in the strange position of wanting to be urged to pass legislation that would benefit themselves.

They need encouragement from the voters back home to pass Senate bill 1663, which would raise the salaries of themselves and the judges of United States courts and would make provision for increases, at the discretion of the attorney general, in the salaries of United States attorneys and their assistants.

The bill has been reported favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee. That committee's report presents convincing arguments in favor of its passage.

The salary increase for Members of Congress and for the Federal judges would amount to \$10,000, except for the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, for whom the increase would be \$14,500.

It is pointed out in the report that the \$10,000 increase for members of Congress would bring the compensation to \$25,000, from which a Federal income tax of \$5,836 will be taken, leaving a net of \$19,164. This is a net gain of \$9,536 over the net salary of 1939. But when the increase in cost of living is considered, the proposed new salary arrangement would buy for a Member of Congress just about what his 1939 salary bought in that year.

An argument that the Federal judges are underpaid is emphasized by a comparison shown between the salaries they receive and those received by some State judges. At present the chief justice receives \$25,500; the chief judge of the court of appeals of New York receives \$35,000. Associate justices receive \$25,000; the associate judges of the court of appeals of New York receive \$32,500.

In the face of such compelling arguments in favor of the bill, however, there is a good chance Members of Congress will hesitate to pass it—unless they have assurance from the folks back home that they want the bill passed.

After all, this Congress is dedicated to economy, to cutting expenses. Members who expect to face voters in a year or two will feel that granting themselves a pay raise will be material their enemies could use against them.

As a matter of simple justice to public officials in highly responsible positions, we hope Congress realizes that the voters want those officials properly paid.

[From the Hutchinson (Kans.) News Herald of July 5, 1953]

JUDGES' PAY

The other day in his press conference President Eisenhower made the observation that, with taxes what they are, we are rapidly approaching the time when it will be difficult to get the best man to enter and remain in Government unless they have independent financial means. He was saying he believed that Government salaries should be raised so that the best-qualified people, poor or rich, could enter and stay in public life.

The American Bar Association agrees emphatically with that view. The association believes it is false economy—and dangerous to the country's future—if salaries are not realistic enough to attract the wisest and ablest men to assume the immense responsibilities of government.

Furthermore, we believe it would be entirely consistent with the President's program of Government economy if the Congress were to enact, at this session, the pending bill to increase by \$10,000 per year the salaries of United States judges and Members of Congress, and to authorize the Attorney General to establish district attorneys' salaries between \$12,000 and \$20,000 per year. The cost of such an increase would be a minute fraction of 1 percent of the Federal budget. We are confident the future benefits, in terms of better government, better administration of our courts and better enforcement of our criminal laws, would far outweigh the comparatively small cost. As one editor recently put it, higher pay could save billions at the cost of thousands.

Four years ago the Hoover Commission recommended substantial increases in Federal salaries in all branches—executive, legislative, and judicial.

This is not a partisan issue. Members of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, of both parties have approved the bill unanimously. Certainly the Hoover Commission study was nonpartisan. The pending bill has not been made a partisan target in any other quarter.

Sincerely,

ROBERT G. STOREY.

DALLAS.

[From the Belleville (Ill.) Advocate of July 1, 1953]

SALARY INCREASES FOR JUDGES, SENATORS, AND REPRESENTATIVES

United States Senate bill 1663 proposes a substantial salary increase for Members of Congress and United States judges.

The increase in each category, by terms of the bill, would be \$10,000 annually. The only exception is in the case of the Chief Justice of the United States, whose salary increase would be \$14,500, bringing his salary to \$40,000 annually.

Associate judges would receive \$35,000; United States circuit, court of claims, and custom patent appeal and military appeals court judges, \$27,500; United States district, customs court, and tax court judges, \$25,000.

The proposal, which has the endorsement of the American Bar Association, does not seem unreasonable.

In every instance the duties of office are of the utmost importance to our welfare.

To be sure, a higher salary does not necessarily mean better men will be named to the offices. But there is this to be said for it that men who have achieved outstanding success in their professions and business will find the offices more attractive.

There are many instances where men who seek congressional posts actually have no business or profession but depend upon politics for their existence. These have found any emoluments of office attractive.

Is it not possible that men and women who have been successful outside of politics would find being a Representative in Congress or a Senator worthwhile under such conditions? Not that they would make more money, but that they would at least be compensated in part for lending their energy and their talents to the enactment of legislation which so often falls under the spell of the mountebank.

It might even give them heart for the rigors of an election campaign.

Judges, of course, do not face this ordeal.

Do not be deluded, however, that it is possible to buy talent and integrity in one package as you might get a double bargain in breakfast food and chewing gum.

Talent and integrity combined sell for only one price in the market place: The soul-satisfying conviction of the necessity for doing well whatever comes to hand, regardless of emoluments and honors.

[From the Wausau (Wis.) Daily Record-Herald of June 30, 1953]

A BETTER WAY

The manner in which the Senate Judiciary Committee proposes to increase the remuneration of the Nation's lawmakers is a much better and more straightforward way of doing it than that voted by the House.

The Senate group proposed raising the salaries of all Members from \$15,000 to \$25,000. The House voted to allow its Members to deduct from their taxable income the total cost of living expenses in Washington.

The purpose in either program is laudable. The job is an extremely important one and the remuneration should be adequate if not munificent. The \$25,000 salary suggested by judiciary group would give the lawmakers but slightly more purchasing power than the \$10,000 salary in effect in 1939, considering the great drop in the value of the dollar.

The public, however, would prefer that it be done openly and aboveboard, we believe, rather than through the device of avoiding taxes.

Presumably, the House preferred to be coy about the matter because of the economy drive. However, failure to provide proper compensation for the Nation's lawmakers is an instance of false economy. Increased pay for lawmakers and others in highly responsible positions in Government is consistent with the President's program of economy and has his support.

The American Bar Association has pointed out that salary increases for Congressmen, United States judges and others under the Senate Judiciary Committee proposal would amount to but a small fraction of 1 percent of the Federal budget.

The small cost of such pay increases would be far outweighed by the future benefits in terms of better government and better administration of justice.

[From the Newton (Kans.) Kansan Republican of June 29, 1953]

BAR ENDORSES PAY HIKE

The American Bar Association agrees with a recently expressed view of President Eisenhower, that with taxes what they are, we are approaching the time when it will be difficult to get the best men to enter and remain in government, unless they have independent financial means. The association construes that he was saying he believes Government salaries should be raised so that the best qualified people, poor or rich, could enter and stay in public life.

A statement by Robert G. Storey, president of the ABA, in part, follows:

"The American Bar Association agrees emphatically with that view. The association believes it is false economy—and dangerous with the country's future—if salaries are not realistic enough to attract the wisest and ablest men to assume the immense responsibilities of government.

"Furthermore, we believe it would be entirely consistent with the President's program of Government economy if the Congress were to enact, at this session, the pending bill (S. 1663) to increase by \$10,000 per year the salaries of United States judges and members of Congress, and to authorize the Attorney General to establish district attorneys' salaries between \$12,000 and \$20,000 per year. The cost of such an increase would be a minute fraction of 1 percent of the Federal budget. We are confident the future benefits, in terms of better government, better administration of our courts, and better enforcement of our criminal laws, would far outweigh the comparatively small cost. As one editor recently put it, higher pay could save billions at the cost of thousands.

"Four years ago the Hoover Commission recommended substantial increases in Federal salaries in all branches—executive, legislative and judicial. The Congress did raise executive salaries, but not those in the judicial and legislative branches. We believe the time has come to put into full effect the Hoover Commission salary recommendations, which the pending bill would do."

[From the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of July 14, 1953]

JUDICIAL SALARIES

When the high cost of living comes up in conversation someone usually concedes that prices are much higher than they were back in the 1930's. But he quickly adds, "Of course, we can't complain because we're all making more money than we were then."

Most Americans, we suppose, would agree that rising incomes have, indeed, eased the pain of paying out more dollars for the necessities of life. Not so our Federal judges, whose incomes have been steadily diminishing since 1939, when their salaries were ruled subject to the Federal income tax. In that year the consumers' price index stood at 99.6. Last November 15th it stood at 191.6, an increase of 92 percent. Thus the \$11,696 which remained of a Federal district judge's salary after payment of Federal taxes had purchasing power equal to \$6,080 in 1939.

To remedy this situation bills have been introduced in Congress to raise the salaries of all Federal judges by \$10,000 a year. If enacted, district judges now receiving \$15,000 would receive \$25,000. Circuit judges now

receiving \$17,500 would get \$27,500 and so on. Similar increases for Senators and Congressmen also are authorized in accordance with recommendations of the Hoover commission.

While talk of pay increases seems presumptuous when the Federal budget is out of balance, an upward adjustment of judicial salaries is long overdue. It would put a stop to what the American Bar Association describes as "an alarming increase in resignations of experienced judges from the bench," would encourage more able and qualified persons to accept judicial appointments, and would restore the independence and self-respect of judges now in office by ending their financial worries.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of July 11, 1953]

UNDERPAID FEDERAL BENCH

The McCarran bill in the Senate, proposing a substantial increase in salaries of the Federal judiciary and members of Congress, deserves thoughtful and sympathetic consideration. Both these arms of national Government are underpaid by current standards, and such a situation bodes no good for the future.

The measure would boost the compensation of United States judges and Congressmen by \$10,000 a year, increase the salary of the Chief Justice from \$25,500 to \$40,000, and create a salary range for United States attorneys of from \$12,000 to \$20,000 annually.

Thus Federal District judges now getting \$15,000 a year would receive \$25,000; judges in the Federal Court of Appeals, Court of Customs and Court of Claims would get \$27,500 instead of the present \$17,500; Associate Justices of the Supreme Court would have \$35,000 a year instead of \$25,000. Members of the Senate, who now receive \$12,500 salary and \$2,500 expenses, would be raised to \$25,000 a year. It is customary and proper that Congressmen be paid at least as much as lower members of the Federal bench.

These seem like fat pay increments, certainly to the rank and file of citizens. But there are solid arguments bolstering such increases.

Since 1939, when a District judge received \$10,000 a year, living costs have ballooned some 92 percent. The last salary increase for the Federal judiciary was in 1946, when District judges were advanced to \$15,000 per annum, and other bench members accordingly. The salary of an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court was raised to \$25,000. The increase now asked is somewhat more than the 92 percent rise in living costs between 1939 and now. But extraordinarily high Federal taxes must now be paid by members of the bench; several decades ago Federal salaries were exempt.

It is entirely possible that capable men for the Federal bench can continue to be recruited, without salary increases, because of the prestige and tenure attached. But the possibility grows steadily less likely.

Jacob M. Lashly, former president of the American Bar Association, offers pertinent comment on this question. Mr. Lashly is chairman of an ABA committee for this eighth circuit working for the success of the McCarran bill. If the present scale of salaries is continued, Mr. Lashly considers, it seems probable that appointments to the bench will have to be made either from among lawyers of independent means or from among those who have been unsuccessful in practice. Neither alternative is desirable for the public or the bench.

Various members of the New York and Pennsylvania judiciary receive more than Associate Justices of the United States Supreme Court. This is an imbalance without reasonable justification. The Hoover Commission advocated salaries for the most responsible officers of Government "in some measure" competitive with salaries of private industry. Federal judges and Members

of Congress are among the most responsible officials of National Government.

[From the Kansas City Times of July 1, 1953]

FOR THE BEST IN GOVERNMENT

More adequate pay as an encouragement to men of ability to enter public life has the strong support of the American Bar Association. Its president, Robert G. Storey, cites the recent statement of President Eisenhower that Government salaries ought to be raised to make it possible for the best qualified people to enter and remain in the service of the country.

This of course is a familiar question. It is neither partisan nor political and action on it has been urged by Democrats and Republicans alike. Something has been done already. Four years ago the nonpartisan Hoover commission recommended salary increases in all branches of the Government—executive, legislative, and judicial. Congress did act properly on salaries in the executive department, including the President, members of the Cabinet and others. Now the legislative and judicial branches demand attention.

A pending bill has been approved unanimously by the Senate Judiciary Committee. It would increase the pay of Members of Congress and Federal judges by \$10,000 a year and would authorize a scale of total pay ranging from \$12,000 to \$20,000 a year for United States district attorneys. This would bring Congress Members to \$25,000 a year and Federal judges to the same or a somewhat higher figure, depending on the courts they were serving.

It is pointed out that such a program would not be inconsistent with economy in Government, that its cost would be only a small fraction of 1 percent of the total and that it should contribute to a quality of service that might result in the saving of billions of dollars. It awaits only the final attention of Congress. So far as its own pay is concerned, any increase voted by that body would become effective only with a new Congress. The field seems to be clear for a decision.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register of June 27, 1953]

THESE SALARY RAISES ARE LONG OVERDUE

With Congress scrutinizing every measure with an eye to cutting expenditures, it is nearly impossible to get a committee nowadays to approve an increase. Nevertheless, the Senate Judiciary Committee has voted unanimously for a bill that would boost the cost of government nearly \$6 million a year.

The measure would provide an across-the-board salary raise of \$10,000 for Representatives, Senators, and United States Judges. The Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court would be raised \$14,500, and there would be increases for United States attorneys and their assistants, as well as for top-level attorneys in the Justice Department.

We agree with the Senate committee that this is sound economy over the long run. One of the major roadblocks to getting competent men, either to run for office or to accept appointments, has been the inadequacy of government pay.

Congressmen, for example, earn salaries of \$15,000 a year, on which they must maintain two homes and be able to devote most of their time to government business. To make ends meet in expensive Washington many of them have had to seek extra income from such things as lecturing and article-writing.

The salaries of United States judges, which for most are in the \$15,000-\$17,000 range, are also inadequate considering their responsibilities. There have been instances of Federal judges having to draw on their savings and of having to teach night law school in

order to stay on the bench. In at least two cases judges have felt compelled to go into private practice in order to provide for the future of their dependents.

The pay of some State and local justices actually is substantially greater than that of many Federal judges. A number of justices on the New York Supreme Court—the court equivalent to Iowa's District Court—draw as much as \$28,000 a year. This is \$3,000 more than the salary of an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, and \$2,500 more than the Chief Justice receives. In New Jersey, judges in the trial courts of general jurisdiction get higher salaries than all of our Federal judges below the level of the Supreme Court.

In 1939 a Congressman's \$10,000 salary after taxes was \$9,628. Today, despite a \$5,000 raise in the interim, the increase in taxes and cost of living have left him with the purchasing power equivalent of only \$6,500. A \$10,000 increase would add only about \$500 to the purchasing power of congressional salaries compared with 1939.

The Hoover Commission in 1949 recommended salary increases for the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government. The executive raises already have been approved and are in effect. Congress would do well to follow through and grant these additional increases, which are substantially in line with the Commission's recommendations.

[From the Sioux City (Iowa) Journal-Tribune of June 24, 1953]

CONGRESSIONAL RAISE

First reaction to the vote of the House of Representatives permitting the Members full expense deductions for income-tax purposes in lieu of a pay raise seems to have been one of resentment. Press service stories remind us that the same House has kept individual income-tax legislation bottled up since February, and that while voting themselves the equivalent of a substantial raise the Members at the same time cut out a new official car for the Capitol Architect, and withdrew his expense money for this year on the old car. Meanwhile, almost everybody seems to be predicting that the Senate will knock out the House move.

Although not resenting the House move particularly, it still seems like a good idea to compensate congressional Members according to the times in which all of us live, with the idea of making it entirely possible for the nonwealthy to be able to afford being a lawmaker. A policymaker for a multi-million-dollar business or industry would not be hired at the \$15,000 official income paid Congressmen; too many not very competent policymakers can be hired for that sum. Of course, a pay increase for Congressmen is no guaranty, either, that all Congressmen will be fully competent; but a greater salary should serve to interest more persons of competence in becoming candidates for Congress, to the advantage of the country.

However, any back-door methods of achieving a pay raise are not quite in line with the frank and open action expected of people who make our national laws, and the House action is questioned on that basis alone. Congressmen deserve adequate compensation, but it ought to be front-door compensation with nothing being added that has any resemblance to a tip.

[From the Tiffin (Ohio) Advertiser-Tribune of July 2, 1953]

FOR BETTER GOVERNMENT

The other day in his press conference President Eisenhower made the observation that the Nation is rapidly approaching the time when it will be difficult to get the best men to enter and remain in Government unless they have independent financial means. He was saying he believed that Gov-

ernment salaries should be raised so that the best qualified people, poor or rich, could enter and stay in public life.

The American Bar Association agrees emphatically with that view. The association believes it is false economy—and dangerous to the country's future—if salaries are not realistic enough to attract the wisest and ablest men to assume the immense responsibilities of Government.

Furthermore, the association believes it would be entirely consistent with the President's program of Government economy if the Congress were to enact, at this session, the pending bill (S. 1663) to increase by \$10,000 per year the salaries of United States judges and Members of Congress, and to authorize the Attorney General to establish district attorneys' salaries between \$12,000 and \$20,000 per year. The cost of such an increase would be a minute fraction of 1 percent of the Federal budget. The future benefits, in terms of better government, better administration of our courts and better enforcement of our criminal laws, could far outweigh the cost.

Four years ago the Hoover Commission recommended substantial increases in Federal salaries in all branches—executive, legislative and judicial. The Congress did raise executive salaries, but not those in the judicial and legislative branches.

In cooperation with State and local bar associations, the ABA is seeking to inform the people of the facts with respect to this public question.

This is not a partisan issue. Members of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, of both parties, have approved the bill unanimously. Certainly the Hoover Commission study was nonpartisan. The pending bill has not been made a partisan target in any other quarter. A number of leading national organizations, representing various shades of political opinion, have indicated their support of the legislation.

It is the hope of the American Bar Association that the public know the import and urgency of this question which bears directly upon the quality of Government we are to have in the years ahead, and thus vitally affects every citizen.

[From the Elkhart (Ind.) Truth of July 1, 1953]

DOLLAR LURE FOR BETTER OFFICIALS

Businessmen often say you have to spend money to make money. Perhaps you have to spend money to save money, sometimes.

At any rate that is the contention of the American Bar Association, and others who have come out strongly for Senate bill 1663.

This bill would increase annual salaries in the legislative and judicial branches of Federal Government.

Congress, who now get \$15,000 (which includes a \$2,500 expense allowance) would get \$25,000. Federal judges would also get \$10,000 more apiece; for instance, Supreme Court Justices would go from \$25,000 to \$35,000. United States attorneys and assistants also would get more.

Such increases were recommended for executive, legislative, and judicial branches 4 years ago, by the Hoover Commission on economy in Government. Congress, at the time, raised executive salaries only.

It is always a question exactly what attracts qualified persons to the public service.

We like to think it is primarily patriotism and a sense of duty. In many cases this is certainly a factor.

On the other hand, it is also probable that many other qualified persons have not felt they could make the sacrifice.

Elkhart has seen one example of this, for our post of county health unit director has gone unfilled more than 2 years, even though the position pays more than other local Government jobs.

It is likely the Federal Government also faces this dilemma.

Looking at it negatively, we may wonder to what extent Government inefficiency has been due to substandard officeholders.

Would some of the logjams in Federal court dockets be cleared up, for example, if we had an influx of more qualified judges and attorneys?

Would we even be able to avoid establishing some of the proposed new court districts? Would Congress act with greater dispatch and efficiency if it consisted of better qualified personnel?

We don't know that these things would happen. But it is significant that the economy minded Hoover Commission thought so.

[From the Fort Atkinson (Wis.) Daily Jefferson of June 29, 1953]

CHEAPER GOVERNMENT BY BIGGER SPENDING

The American Bar Association has come out in support of President Dwight Eisenhower, who made the observation the other day that, with taxes what they are, we are rapidly approaching the time when it will be difficult to get the best men to enter and remain in Government unless they have independent financial means.

The President added that he believed that Government salaries should be raised so that the best qualified people, poor or rich, could enter and stay in public life.

The American Bar Association agrees emphatically with that view. The association believes it is false economy and dangerous to the country's future if salaries are not realistic enough to attract the wisest and ablest men to assume the immense responsibilities of government.

Furthermore, the association believes it would be entirely consistent with the President's program of Government economy if the Congress were to enact at this session the pending bill (S. 1663) to increase by \$10,000 per year the salaries of United States judges and Members of Congress, and to authorize the Attorney General to establish district attorneys' salaries between \$12,000 and \$20,000 per year.

The association points out that the cost of such an increase would be a minute fraction of 1 percent of the Federal budget, and adds that it is confident the future benefits, in terms of better Government, better administration of our courts, and better enforcement of our criminal laws, would far outweigh the comparatively small cost.

Four years ago the Hoover Commission recommended substantial increases in Federal salaries in all branches—executive, legislative, and judicial. The Congress did raise executive salaries, but not those in the judicial and legislative branches. We believe the time has come to put into full effect the Hoover Commission salary recommendations, which the pending bill would do.

It doesn't sound logical to cut expenses by raising salaries, perhaps. Yet, higher pay could save billions at the cost of thousands.

[From the Fairmount (Minn.) Daily Sentinel of July 3, 1953]

ON THE RIGHT TRACK

The American Bar Association is making a concerted effort to have the salaries of Members of Congress, judges of United States courts, and United States attorneys increased.

The bar association agrees with a statement made recently by President Eisenhower that with constantly increasing taxes, it will be more and more difficult to get good men to leave better paying positions in private business, the professions, and industry to take Government jobs.

The Sentinel can agree with President Eisenhower and the bar association. For years it has contended that the pay offered for critical positions in governmental affairs

is inadequate, especially in our courts and in our law-enforcement departments of our Government.

United States attorneys, State attorneys, county and city attorneys often are forced to face lawyers who get as much for a single appearance as they do for an entire year's services. There isn't much argument to the claim that underpaid officials are easier prey for crime syndicates, gangsters, crooks, politicians, influence peddlers than would be a well-paid, financially independent official.

There was a time when \$10,000 a year wasn't too bad for a Congressman or a Federal judge, even though they had to maintain two residences and run for reelection every 2 or 4 years. But that time has passed.

Those interested in breaking and evading the law pay more. The American people, whose security and well-being depend upon having incorruptible representatives, prosecuting attorneys, and courts, can't afford to pay less.

The McCarran bill should become law.

THE McCARRAN-WALTER ACT AND BORIS CHRISTOFF

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a recent issue of the Washington Post carried an article, under the byline of Mr. Paul Hume, referring to Mr. Boris Christoff as a McCarran Act victim.

In the course of this article, Mr. Hume wrote:

This great artist, whose peers the world can never find in sufficient numbers, has never been to this country. The Metropolitan Opera wanted him as long ago as three seasons back, when Rudolf Bing was preparing his first opening night as the Met's new managing director.

Bing wanted Christoff for the great bass role of Philip II in Verdi's Don Carlo, and had signed a contract with the Bulgarian-born singer for the season. What happened? The McCarran Act.

A little further along in the article this statement appears:

For the time being, this man, fortunately still in his early thirties, will continue to thrill European audiences while the McCarran Act prevents Americans from hearing him.

Mr. President, the so-called McCarran Act about which Mr. Hume writes, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, was not in existence three seasons ago; so that Mr. Hume's statement is, on its face, inaccurate.

The fact of the matter is that Boris Christoff was refused a visa in 1950, which was 2 years before the enactment of the McCarran Act. The basis for this visa refusal goes back to the law enacted at the beginning of the visa system. The McCarran Act liberalized that law to some extent, but not enough to permit the issuance of a visa in such a case. That the alien may have had a contract with the Metropolitan Opera Co. did not remove the grounds upon which the visa was refused; and in fact, this circumstance had no bearing upon the action taken by the Visa Division.

No man is above the law, Mr. President, simply because he happens to have a great talent. But I did not rise today to discuss either the talent of Mr. Christoff, or the reasons why he was denied a visa. My purpose is only to point out that this is another instance in which the Immigration and Nationality Act is being blamed for a state of facts to which

it did not contribute; is being charged with a result which it did not produce. This is a greatly overworked tactic on the part of those who seek to discredit this law in an effort to bring about its repeal or substantial modification. I doubt that Mr. Hume deliberately and intentionally employed this tactic; I think, rather, that perhaps he was misled. But I know that his readership is large, and I felt, therefore, that this factual explanation should be made.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution to establish the Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 725).

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H. R. 2062. A bill to permit the coordination of the Wisconsin retirement fund with the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system (Rept. No. 726);

H. R. 3276. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret D. Surhan (Rept. No. 727);

H. R. 4151. A bill to provide wage credits under title II of the Social Security Act for military service before July 1, 1955, and to extend the time for filing application for lump-sum death payments under such title with respect to the death of certain individuals dying in the service who are reinterrred (Rept. No. 728);

H. R. 4980. A bill to amend section 3250 (1) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that a person entitled to drawback with respect to certain nonbeverage products may elect to receive such drawback on a monthly instead of a quarterly basis (Rept. No. 729); and

H. R. 6402. A bill to provide for abatement of jeopardy assessments when jeopardy does not exist (Rept. No. 730).

By Mr. BRICKER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment:

S. 2069. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act so as to authorize national banking associations to make loans on forest tracts (Rept. No. 731).

By Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1796. A bill to incorporate the Board of Fundamental Education (Rept. No. 736).

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

H. R. 6281. A bill to reimburse the Post Office Department for the transmission of official Government mail matter (Rept. No. 732).

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution authorizing the recognition of the 200th anniversary of the founding of Columbia University in the city of New York, and providing for the representation of the Government and the people of the United States in the observance of this anniversary (Rept. No. 733); and

S. J. Res. 99. Joint resolution creating a committee to assist in the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the Congress of 1754, held at Albany, N. Y., on June 24 of that year (Rept. No. 734).

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution commemorating the three hundredth anniversary of the formation of Westmoreland County, Va. (Rept. No. 735).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 236. A bill for the relief of Amir Hassan Sepahban (Rept. No. 737);

S. 482. A bill for the relief of Jean Tokuda (Rept. No. 738);

S. 502. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Weigand (Rept. No. 739);

S. 706. A bill for the relief of Charlotte Witzeling Robinson (Rept. No. 742);

S. 982. A bill for the relief of Helena Lewicka (Rept. No. 743);

S. 1226. A bill for the relief of Stefan Virgilius Issarescu (Rept. No. 744);

S. 1652. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Tyrrell (Rept. No. 745);

S. 1656. A bill for the relief of Gerolf Lamprecht (Rept. No. 746);

S. 2073. A bill for the relief of Esther Wagner (Rept. No. 747);

S. 2108. A bill for the relief of Lieselotte Semmer (Rept. No. 748);

S. 2117. A bill for the relief of Philip Jack Sager (Koichi Sasaki) (Rept. No. 749);

S. 2151. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ala Olejak (nee Holubowa) (Rept. No. 750);

S. 2318. A bill for the relief of Jon Jeffrey Williams (Rept. No. 751);

H. R. 2602. A bill for the relief of Elzbieta Grzymowska Jarosz (Rept. No. 795);

H. R. 2750. A bill for the relief of the city and county of Denver, Colo. (Rept. No. 796);

H. R. 2785. A bill for the relief of Wera Fazio, a minor (Rept. No. 797);

H. R. 2801. A bill for the relief of David Zorub (Rept. No. 798);

H. R. 2816. A bill for the relief of Sachiko Yuda (Rept. No. 799);

H. R. 3046. A bill for the relief of William Urban Maloney (Rept. No. 800);

H. R. 3142. A bill for the relief of Waltraut Benteler LaMontagne (Rept. No. 801);

H. R. 3223. A bill for the relief of Gisela Korb (nee Unruh) (Rept. No. 802);

H. R. 3235. A bill for the relief of Ruth Rumiko Fukano (Rept. No. 814);

H. R. 3268. A bill for the relief of Hiroki Holloper (Rept. No. 815); and

H. R. 3360. A bill for the relief of Yuriko Akimoto (Rept. No. 816).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 68. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Godschalk (Rept. No. 752);

S. 109. A bill for the relief of Crisanto Castillo Underwood (Rept. No. 753);

S. 123. A bill for the relief of Anni Wilhelmine Skoda (Rept. No. 754);

S. 214. A bill for the relief of Geraldine B. Mathews (Rept. No. 755);

S. 260. A bill for the relief of Ahmet Hal-dun Koca Taskin (Rept. No. 756);

S. 305. A bill for the relief of Antonio Vocale (Rept. No. 757);

S. 353. A bill for the relief of Li Ming (Rept. No. 758);

S. 414. A bill for the relief of Hilary Hess (Rept. No. 776);

S. 606. A bill for the relief of Hannelore Netz and her two children (Rept. No. 741);

S. 1198. A bill for the relief of Vera Helene Hamer (Vera Helga Mueller) and Sonja Margret Hamer (Sonja Margot Mueller) (Rept. No. 777);

S. 1323. A bill for the relief of Lydia L. A. Samraney (Rept. No. 778);

S. 2116. A bill for the relief of Rosa Guglielmo (Rept. No. 779); and

S. 2192. A bill for the relief of Rosa Veronika Schenk (Rept. No. 780).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 3526. A bill for the relief of Josef Ablassmeier; without amendment (Rept. No. 803);

H. R. 3630. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nathalie Iilene; without amendment (Rept. No. 804);

H. R. 3631. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Sonya Goldschmidt; without amendment (Rept. No. 805);

H. R. 3828. A bill for the relief of Antonio Bruno; without amendment (Rept. No. 806);
H. R. 4100. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lau Hong Shee; without amendment (Rept. No. 807);

H. R. 4101. A bill for the relief of Hidenori Utada; without amendment (Rept. No. 808);
H. R. 4328. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edith D. Williamson; without amendment (Rept. No. 809);

H. R. 4375. A bill for the relief of Julia S. Criswell; without amendment (Rept. No. 810);

H. R. 4440. A bill for the relief of Hilde Kretz Sforza; without amendment (Rept. No. 829);

H. R. 5118. A bill for the relief of Louise Kaden and Elke Beate Kaden; without amendment (Rept. No. 826);

H. R. 5470. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Mario Veltri; with an amendment (Rept. No. 827);

H. R. 5486. A bill for the relief of Irene Andrews; without amendment (Rept. No. 828);

S. 1018. A bill for the relief of George Ellis Ellison; with an amendment (Rept. No. 830);

H. R. 5887. A bill for the relief of George Michael Jabour; without amendment (Rept. No. 831);

H. R. 5951. A bill for the relief of Eveline Brigitte Bartl (Eveline B. Hermann); without amendment (Rept. No. 811);

S. 827. A bill for the relief of Matthew J. Berckman; with an amendment (Rept. No. 812);

H. R. 777. A bill for the relief of Richard H. Backus; without amendment (Rept. No. 813);

H. R. 1116. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit the transportation of fireworks into any State in which the sale or use of such fireworks is prohibited; with an amendment (Rept. No. 781);

H. R. 395. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice; without amendment (Rept. No. 782);

H. R. 660. A bill for the relief of Frank B. Pindle; without amendment (Rept. No. 783);

H. R. 684. A bill for the relief of Kim Jung Soo; without amendment (Rept. No. 784);

H. R. 723. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fumiko Sawal Skovran; without amendment (Rept. No. 785);

H. R. 728. A bill for the relief of Helga G. Jordan and her son; without amendment (Rept. No. 786);

H. R. 812. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. India Taylor Palmi Stevenson; without amendment (Rept. No. 787);

H. R. 814. A bill for the relief of Lt. Thomas C. Rooney and Mrs. Thomas C. Rooney, his wife; without amendment (Rept. No. 759);

H. R. 837. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. James D. Wilmeth; without amendment (Rept. No. 760);

H. R. 871. A bill for the relief of Orsola Jacopelli Leggio; without amendment (Rept. No. 761);

H. R. 917. A bill for the relief of Luigi Lottito; without amendment (Rept. No. 762);

H. R. 937. A bill for the relief of the estate of Frank DeNuzzi and Cecelia Melnik Burns; without amendment (Rept. No. 763);

H. R. 953. A bill for the relief of Jakabs Lenbergs; without amendment (Rept. No. 764);

H. R. 954. A bill for the relief of Edith Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 765);

H. R. 975. A bill for the relief of Dr. Dudley A. Reekie; without amendment (Rept. No. 766);

H. R. 1124. A bill for the relief of Gerda Goerauch; without amendment (Rept. No. 767);

H. R. 1460. A bill for the relief of Harold Joe Davis; without amendment (Rept. No. 768);

H. R. 1629. A bill for the relief of Miss Aiko Ikehara; without amendment (Rept. No. 769);

H. R. 1756. A bill for the relief of Eugene de Thassy; without amendment (Rept. No. 770);

H. R. 1792. A bill for the relief of Lee Lai Ha; without amendment (Rept. No. 771);

H. R. 1892. A bill for the relief of Nicola Lucia, and Rocco Fierro; without amendment (Rept. No. 772);

H. R. 2029. A bill for the relief of Rose Maria Gradelone Callicchio; without amendment (Rept. No. 773);

H. R. 2158. A bill for the relief of Col. Harry F. Cunningham; with an amendment (Rept. No. 774);

H. R. 2162. A bill for the relief of Cyril Claude Andersen, Patricia Andersen Hill, and Thelma Andersen McNeill; without amendment (Rept. No. 775);

H. R. 2396. A bill for the relief of Harry Clay Maul, Jr.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 788); and

S. 532. A bill for the relief of Guiglio Squillari, Mrs. Barbero Margiorina Squillari, Iosanna Squillari, and Eugenio Squillari; with amendments (Rept. No. 740).

By Mr. MCCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 2511. A bill for the relief of the city of Reno, Nev.; without amendment (Rept. No. 789).

By Mr. CASE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 6252. A bill to amend the charter of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America so as to limit membership on the National Council of Girl Scouts to citizens of the United States, to authorize meetings of the national council as provided in the constitution, and to authorize an annual report based upon the preceding fiscal year; without amendment (Rept. No. 790).

By Mr. BEALL, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 987. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass.; with amendments (Rept. No. 791); and

H. R. 1917. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase; without amendment (Rept. No. 792).

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 3409. A bill to terminate certain Federal restrictions upon Indians; with amendments (Rept. No. 793); and

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that certain tribes of Indians should be freed from Federal supervision; without amendment (Rept. No. 794).

By Mr. BRICKER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

H. R. 5976. A bill to amend section 1 of the Natural Gas Act (Rept. No. 817); and

H. R. 6354. A bill to authorize the Coast Guard to accept, operate, and maintain a certain defense housing facility at Cape May, N. J. (Rept. No. 818).

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 1918. A bill to amend section 9 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946; with an amendment (Rept. No. 819); and

H. R. 2234. A bill to amend the rules for the prevention of collisions on certain inland waters of the United States and on the western rivers; without amendment (Rept. No. 820).

By Mr. POTTER from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2409. A bill to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of new ship construction, and for other

purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 821).

ADDITIONAL BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Additional bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2537. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to hear, determine, and render judgment in the case of Clackamas County, Oreg., against Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, and Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2538. A bill to establish a commission to study and recommend improvements in the laws relating to financial practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 2539. A bill to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of Turkey; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. J. Res. 108. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Natural Resources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

JURISDICTION OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, IN THE CASE OF CLACKAMAS COUNTY, OREG., AGAINST DOUGLAS MCKAY, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, AND EZRA TAFT BENSON, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, to hear, determine, and render judgment in the case of Clackamas County, Oreg., against Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, and Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a letter which the chief counsel for Clackamas County, Oreg., Richard L. Merrick, wrote to the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER, United States Senator, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, in explanation of the legal issue that is the subject matter of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2537) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to hear, determine, and render judgment in the case of Clackamas County, Oreg., against Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, and Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, was received, read

twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to hear, determine, and render judgment on the cause of action involved in the case of Clackamas County, Oreg., against Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, and Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, now pending on appeal in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, any judgment rendered therein to be subject to appeal in the same manner as now provided by law for actions within the jurisdiction of said District Court.

SEC. 2. Upon enactment of this act, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia is requested to certify or remand the legal proceeding referred to in the first section to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for trial on the merits.

The letter presented by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

JUNE 29, 1953.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: There is enclosed herewith a draft of a bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to hear, determine, and render judgment on the issues involved in the legal action entitled "Clackamas County, Oregon, Plaintiff v. Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, and Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, Defendants," which is now pending on appeal in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit following a judgment by Judge Holtzoff dismissing the complaint on the ground that the action is one against the United States and consent for its filing has not been granted.

Since the bill relates to a subject within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, it is hoped that you will introduce this measure or one of similar import in the Senate.

An explanation of the background of the pending litigation and the necessity for legislative relief is set forth herein as follows:

GRANT LANDS INVOLVED

In carrying out the national policy for developing the western part of the Nation, Congress, by the acts of July 25, 1866 (14 Stat. 239); June 25, 1868 (15 Stat. 80); April 10, 1869 (16 Stat. 47), and May 4, 1870 (16 Stat. 94), granted to such railroad company as the Oregon State Legislature might designate more than 3½ million acres of public lands in western Oregon to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from Portland southward to the California border. The Oregon Legislature designated the Oregon and California Railroad Co. as the beneficiary of the grant.

Congress provided in the granting acts that the lands should be sold by the railroad company to actual settlers only in tracts not larger than 160 acres to any one settler and for prices not exceeding \$2.50 per acre. Title to all the lands became vested in the railroad company subject to such actual settler covenant by 1870.

LITIGATION TO TEST SETTLER CLAUSE

During the year 1907, John L. Snyder, an actual settler on granted land, brought a suit in the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to test the validity of the actual settler clause.

He was represented by A. W. Lafferty, then a young lawyer, who later served two terms as a Member of the United States House of Representatives from Oregon.

Snyder's lawsuit was followed the same year by a suit brought by the United States

against the railroad company seeking to forfeit the title to all lands granted to the railroad company then unsold, on the ground that the company had violated the actual settler clause by selling the lands to other than actual settlers in tracts larger than 160 acres and for prices exceeding \$2.50 per acre. The Snyder suit and the one brought by the Government were consolidated for trial and tried at Portland, resulting in a judgment declaring forfeiture of title to the United States of the lands then held by the railroad company (186 Fed. Rep. 861). On appeal, however, the Supreme Court of the United States, on June 21, 1915 (238 U. S. 411), reversed the decree of forfeiture, holding that there could be no forfeiture, but that Congress might enact further appropriate legislation dealing with the granted lands.

CONGRESS PASSES LEGISLATION REVESTING TITLE IN GOVERNMENT

Following the litigation mentioned, Congress passed three acts, namely, the Chamberlain Act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. 218); the Stanfield Act of July 13, 1926 (44 Stat. 915); and the McNary Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 874), all dealing with the granted lands.

The Chamberlain Act provided, in effect, that title to all lands not sold prior to July 1, 1913, amounting to 2,500,000 acres, was re-vested in the United States, and directed the Attorney General of the United States to bring a suit and "have determined the amount of moneys which have been received by the railroad company" from the lands, which should be charged against it as part of the full value of \$2.50 per acre secured to it by the granting acts.

M'NARY ACT PROVIDES FOR DISTRIBUTION OF MONEY FROM LANDS AMONG 18 OREGON COUNTIES

The McNary Act of 1937, which is the one currently controlling, provides in effect for the sale of the ripe timber from the lands, 75 percent of the proceeds thereof to be distributed among the 18 Oregon counties wherein the lands are situated, and 25 percent to be used by the Government for administration purposes. That act specifically provides "That notwithstanding any provisions of the acts of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. 218), and February 26, 1919 (40 Stat. 1179), as amended, such portions of the re-vested Oregon and California Railroad and re-conveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands as are or may hereafter come under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, which have heretofore or may hereafter be classified as timberlands, and power-site lands valuable for timber, shall be managed * * * for permanent forest production, and the timber thereon shall be sold, cut, and removed in conformity with the principle of sustained yield * * *." The McNary Act also provides, in effect, that the lands shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, and for the deposit of moneys received therefrom in a special account in the Treasury designated as the Oregon and California land-grant fund. The Secretary of the Interior also is directed to certify on the 1st day of July of each year to the United States Treasury and the General Accounting Office the amount of money due each of the 18 Oregon counties wherein the lands lie, 1 of them being Clackamas County.

ATTORNEY GENERAL BRINGS ACCOUNTING SUIT

In accordance with directions contained in the Chamberlain Act of 1916, the Department of Justice brought an accounting suit against the Oregon & California Railroad Co. and others for the purposes specified in the act. The result of that litigation so far as pertinent here will be mentioned later herein.

PRESIDENT ESTABLISHES FOREST RESERVES

The act of March 3, 1891 (16 Stat. 1095), authorized the President to establish forest reserves and other public reservations "in

any part of the public lands." Exercising power thereunder, the President, by proclamation, on June 17, 1892, established the Bull Run Forest Reserve, and on September 28, 1893, the Cascade Range Forest Reserve. Four hundred and seventy-two thousand acres of the Oregon and California grant lands are located within the boundaries of these forest reserves and are said, for that reason, to be "controversial"; that is, there is a controversy as to whether they are forest reserve lands or Oregon & California Railroad grant lands.

By statute, the Department of Agriculture administers forest reserve lands and the Department of the Interior administers other public lands. As above stated, the statutes relating to the re-vested Oregon & California Railroad grant lands specifically confer jurisdiction over their administration on the Secretary of the Interior. There seems to have arisen a dispute between the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture as to which should exercise jurisdiction over the 472,000 acres mentioned above. By an exchange of interdepartmental memoranda during September 1942, an agreement was reached that the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture should "make sales of timber from the Oregon and California lands in controversy," the money arising therefrom "to be put in escrow for distribution when the controversy has been resolved." Under this arrangement a special deposit account was established in the United States Treasury known as "Deposit Fund Account 12 X 6875.110, Suspense Agriculture (Forest Service)" in which funds arising from the 472,000 acres have been and are being deposited. That fund now amounts to approximately \$7 million, no payments therefrom to any of the 18 Oregon counties having been made since its establishment nearly 11 years ago. Apparently little if any effort has been made by the two Departments to settle or resolve the alleged controversy between them. In the meantime, the Oregon counties have been and are now being deprived of the use of funds to which they are justly entitled.

RESULT OF GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTING SUIT

The accounting suit brought against the Oregon & California Railroad Co. under the direction of the Chamberlain Act of 1916 was tried in the United States District Court for the District of Oregon, and a decision there-in was rendered in September 1925. Item 13 (k) of that litigation involved the 472,000 acres of lands within the boundaries of the two forests reserves mentioned above. The pertinent part of the decision of the late Judge Wolverton in that case is reported in 8 Federal Reporter, second series, at page 660, and is as follows:

"Item 13 (k) involves the inquiry touching whether the railroad company should have credit for the 472,000 acres comprised thereby. These lands lie within the indemnity limits of the grant, and were included within the limits of national forest reserves by the proclamation of the President, * * *. The act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. 1095), authorized the President, by proclamation, to set apart public reservations 'in any part of the public lands.' In pursuance of such authority the President on July 17, 1892, set apart the Bull Run Reserve, and on September 28, 1893, the Cascade Range Forest Reserve, and subsequent to June 27, 1900, issued divers proclamations creating and adding numerous public parks and reserves, whereby sundry lands within the indemnity limits of the railroad company's grant were set apart within such reserves. * * * The lands, by reason of the deficiency, as we have seen in our examination of item 13 (i), had previously and necessarily become appropriated to meet the losses sustained to the place grant. They were not at that time a part of the public domain, and were unsusceptible of appropriation by the Government. It results that the rail-

road company is entitled to credit for the whole of the acreage comprised in item 13 (k)."

No appeal was taken from Judge Wolverton's decision, and it is final, and a part of the law of the land as much as any other final judgment of a United States court.

The soundness of Judge Wolverton's decision is clearly demonstrated when attention is brought to the fact that at the time the lands were granted to the railroad company the President had no power to set aside public lands for forest reservations. In fact, he had no such power for 11 years after the lands became vested in the railroad company under the grants. The 2 forest reserves mentioned were established 12 and 13 years after the vesting of title to the lands in the railroad company. In giving the railroad company credit for the 472,000 acres, Judge Wolverton necessarily held that the company was to be paid or allowed the equivalent of \$2.50 per acre therefor. It would have been unlawful to pay the railroad company for the lands if they were not in fact Oregon and California lands.

BASIS FOR CLACKAMAS COUNTY SUIT

Because the funds arising from the 472,000 acres have been frozen in the hands of the Government for nearly 11 years and no effort seems to have been made to distribute them among the 18 Oregon counties wherein the lands are located, Clackamas County brought a suit on May 26, 1952, in the United States District Court for the District of Oregon at Portland against Oscar L. Chapman, then Secretary of the Interior, and Charles F. Brannan, then Secretary of Agriculture, seeking primarily payment to it of its share of the frozen fund, and also praying for relief by way of a mandatory injunction directing the Secretary of the Interior to assume absolute and exclusive jurisdiction over the 472,000 acres of so-called controverted lands and over the funds in the special account and to pay them out to the 18 Oregon counties in accordance with the provisions of the McNary Act of 1937; as well as a prohibitory injunction enjoining interference therewith by the Secretary of Agriculture. Since neither Chapman nor Brannan could be served with process in Oregon, service by registered mail was attempted.

In its complaint, Clackamas County alleged, among other things, that the decision of the United States District Court for the District of Oregon mentioned above is res judicata, definitely determining the status of the 472,000 acres as Oregon and California railroad grant lands, subject under the Chamberlain and McNary Acts to exclusive administration by the Secretary of the Interior.

Under a special appearance, attorneys of the Department of Justice as counsel for Secretaries Chapman and Brannan filed a motion to dismiss the complaint in that legal proceeding on the ground of improper venue and lack of personal service in Oregon on the defendants, and contended that the suit should have been brought in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Thereafter, by an opinion dated November 18, 1952, the Oregon court granted the motion to dismiss and dismissed the complaint. Clackamas County thereupon, on November 20, 1952, filed its suit in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia against the same defendants, seeking the same relief as it sought in the Oregon suit.

Following the change in the political administration of the Government, Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, and Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, upon motion of Clackamas County, were substituted by an appropriate court order as defendants in place of Oscar L. Chapman and Charles F. Brannan, respectively.

On or about February 26, 1953, attorneys of the Department of Justice, acting as counsel for Secretaries McKay and Benson, filed

a motion in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to dismiss the complaint of Clackamas County on the ground, among others, that the proceeding is a suit against the United States and it has not consented to be sued. That motion came on for argument on May 20, 1953, before Judge Alexander Holtzoff, and was granted by him on the ground that the court is without jurisdiction to hear the case on the merits because it is a suit against the United States, a sovereign who has not consented to be sued. Thereupon Clackamas County, on the same day, noted an appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit and the case is now pending on appeal in that court. The brief on behalf of Clackamas County is due to be filed by August 15, 1953, and the brief on behalf of the defendants 25 days after the filing of appellant's brief. A decision in the case is not expected until the spring of 1954. It is likely that the court of appeals will affirm Judge Holtzoff's ruling. The necessity for legislation is readily apparent.

DIFFERENCE OF OPINION BETWEEN DEFENDANTS

There seems to be a difference of opinion as to the merits of the suit brought by Clackamas County between the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture. In a letter dated July 29, 1952, to Mr. Lafferty, Under Secretary of Interior R. D. Searles stated:

"It is perhaps unfortunate that the controverted land problem is not a simple one of determining whether the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior should exercise administrative jurisdiction over the controverted lands.

"This Department holds, as you evidently do, that in the accounting suit decision of 1925, the Federal court decided that the controverted lands were O & C lands. The Department of Agriculture, on the other hand, takes the view that despite the court's decision, the controverted lands are national forest. The disposition of receipts from the controverted lands is involved because the applicable statutes provide a different formula for distribution of national-forest receipts than for that of O & C receipts.

"New legislation therefore has seemed to be necessary. As you know, the Department of the Interior has supported new legislation, the most recent being S. 539 and H. R. 6662 of the 82d Congress, 2d session, which was designed to resolve the jurisdictional dispute and thereby to determine which statute governed distribution of receipts from the controverted lands. We are sure it is your hope, and that of the officials of Clackamas County, that the suit of the county will accomplish the same ends.

"The distribution of receipts from non-controverted lands, although closely related, is a separate matter. We are quite confident that it could be handled equitably for all concerned, independently of the controverted lands issue."

Under forest reserve statutes the 18 Oregon counties would receive only 25 percent of the frozen funds, while under the terms of the McNary Act, the counties would receive 75 percent of those funds.

PURPOSE OF PROPOSED BILL

The accompanying bill proposes to confer jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to hear, determine, and render judgment on the cause of action involved in the Clackamas County litigation, any judgment rendered to be subject to appeal in the same manner as now provided by law for actions within the jurisdiction of said district court. The bill also provides that the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, upon enactment of the legislation, shall certify or remand the pending case to the district court for trial on the merits.

Clackamas County is seeking its day in court, believing that upon the merits of the

case it is entitled to the relief sought, and that the Department of Agriculture is openly defying the decision of a court of the United States having full power and jurisdiction to determine the status of the lands in question. Whether that Department would obey the decision of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, if it should follow the decision of the United States District Court for the District of Oregon remains to be seen. We do not think the Department of Agriculture would disregard the decision of the District of Columbia court.

IMPORTANCE OF LITIGATION

Of the \$7 million in the "frozen" account, Clackamas County is entitled, if the funds are distributed under the McNary Act, to about \$530,000. If distributed under the forest-reserve statutes, its share would be only one-third of that amount. The county needs those funds in the proper performance of its functions as a political subdivision of the State of Oregon; not the one-third, but the entire sum of \$530,000. It believes that in fairness and equity, under the statutes of Congress and the decision of the Oregon District Court, it is entitled to the amount indicated; namely, \$530,000, and that a decision on the merits in its suit will afford the desired relief.

During the course of the argument of the Government's motion to dismiss, Judge Holtzoff stated to counsel for the defendants:

"Then I should think you would welcome this suit in order to decide whether the county is entitled to 25 percent or 75 percent."

That statement appears on page 18 of the reporter's transcript of the proceedings, a copy of which is appended hereto for such consideration as it may merit.

LEGISLATIVE RESULTS NIL

Although, as indicated by Mr. Searles' letter of July 29, 1952, to Mr. Lafferty, the Department of the Interior has favored legislation designed to resolve the supposed controversy between his Department and the Department of Agriculture over the 472,000 acres, no results have been accomplished. There seems little hope for an early disposition of the matter by legislation. It is believed, therefore, that pursuit of the legal remedy is not only desirable but necessary; desirable because it may afford the relief sought, and necessary to demonstrate whether additional legislation actually is required to resolve the supposed jurisdictional controversy.

CONCLUSION

While a great deal more might be said concerning the jurisdictional dispute between the two departments mentioned and the political activities relative thereto, it is believed the foregoing will be found sufficient to indicate the necessity for and desirability of the proposed legislation.

The undersigned expresses the hope that the bill may be introduced in the near future, referred to an appropriate subcommittee for hearings, and considered by the full committee soon thereafter.

Very respectfully yours,

RICHARD L. MERRICK,
Washington Attorney for Clackamas
County.

COMMISSION TO STUDY AND RECOMMEND IMPROVEMENTS IN LAWS RELATING TO FINANCIAL PRACTICES IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a commission to study and recommend improvements in the laws relating to financial practices in

Federal elections, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2538) to establish a commission to study and recommend improvements in the laws relating to financial practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress hereby declares its belief that it is in the public interest to have available as much and as accurate information as possible about the costs and the methods of political campaigns. This information should be effectively presented to the Congress and the public in order that they may consider whether there is need for new legislation dealing with campaign methods and campaign financing, and the nature of new legislation if there is apparent need for such legislation.

The Congress believes that the rising cost of political campaigns presents a potential threat to our Nation's democratic institutions. The problem of money in politics is a continuing problem of democracy, but the increasing cost of mass communication media and the increasing use of television in the appeal to the electorate has raised the cost of political campaigning to alarming heights and has thereby magnified the problem of maintaining free elections in the United States.

The Congress further declares its belief that the methods of political campaigning have a close and continuing connection with the level of morality and efficiency of government.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON FEDERAL CAMPAIGN PRACTICES

SEC. 2. There is hereby established a bipartisan Commission to be known as the Commission on Federal Campaign Practices (hereinafter in this act referred to as the "Commission").

MEMBERSHIP OF COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall be composed of 12 appointed members and the chairmen of the national committees of the two major political parties, ex officio. The 12 appointed members shall be appointed as follows:

(1) Four by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life;

(2) Four by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life; and

(3) Four by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

(b) Of the 4 members provided for in subsection (a) (1) not more than 2 shall be from each of the 2 major political parties, and of the 2 members of each class provided for in subsection (a) (2) and (3), not more than 1 shall be from each of the 2 major political parties.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(e) Eight members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

DUTIES

SEC. 4. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission to make a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of determining what changes, if any, should be made in the existing regulation of financial practices in campaigns for nomination and election (including primary elections) of the President and Vice President and of Senators and Representatives in, and Delegates and Resident Commissioners to, the Congress of the United States. In the course of such study and investigation the Commission shall—

(1) appraise the administration and operation of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities" (the Hatch Act), approved August 2, 1939, as amended, and related legislation;

(2) conduct studies and research in order to determine as accurately as possible the amounts of contributions and expenditures, and the sources of contributions and purposes of expenditures, in campaigns for the nomination and election of President and Vice President;

(3) make studies in order to determine the usual methods and amounts of financial contributions and expenditures, the sources of contributions and purposes of expenditures, in campaigns for United States Senator and Representative in Congress. Such studies need not deal with all congressional campaigns in all districts, but should aim to provide the Commission with representative data. The purpose of such investigations shall be to provide comprehensive factual information which will assist the Commission in its study of existing legislation and its recommendations with respect to changes, if any, in that legislation;

(4) bring together and collate existing research and information bearing upon the field of investigation of the Commission;

(5) study State legislation and experience in the field of campaign finances, with a view to its applicability on a Federal scale;

(6) consider the extent to which publicity will prove effective in keeping campaign contributions and expenditures within reasonable limits, and whether statutory requirements for regular publicity alone would be sufficient safeguard against excessive contributions and expenditures;

(7) consider the desirability of revising or removing all limitations upon the amount of campaign contributions and expenditures, and suggest the amounts in the light of the Commission's research on this subject, if such limitations are recommended.

(8) consider the desirability and feasibility of having the public bear part of the cost of political campaigns, through the Federal Government paying the costs of some items in campaigns;

(9) consider the recent sharp increase in campaign costs due to radio and especially television costs, and consider the possibility of limiting such costs through limitations upon radio and television rates for political programs, or through requirements for the provision of a certain amount of free air time to political candidates as a public service, or through limitations upon campaign expenditures for this purpose;

(10) examine the part played in political campaigns by paid advertising, indirect expenditures and services by private groups and institutions, including so-called "institutional advertising" even where such advertising is confined to the expression of a definite political point of view but does not specifically endorse any political party;

(11) consider the question of whether there are some sources, be they public or private institutions, which ought not to be allowed to contribute to campaign funds because they are subject to too intimate

Government regulation or connection with Government;

(12) examine Federal election machinery generally, with particular regard to means of obtaining more informative election statistics; and detailed and regular methods of reporting contributions, expenditures, and election statistics;

(13) consider the desirability of, and possible methods of centralizing responsibility for reporting of, contributions and expenditures with candidates (or their designated agents) and with national committees of the parties, or other bodies;

(14) consider whether statutory limitations and prohibitions should be imposed upon the use of scurrilous literature and other unethical practices in political campaigns;

(15) make concrete recommendations for the administration of any legislation recommended by the Commission, including the possibility of establishing a permanent commission, or other administrative machinery; and

(16) consider any other matters related to the foregoing, or to the general subject of campaign finances, which the Commission may think it desirable to consider in order to determine what changes should be made in the laws governing nominating and election contributions and expenditures.

(b) Not later than January 31, 1955, the Commission shall submit to the President and to the Congress a complete report of the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

POWERS

SEC. 5. (a) In the performance of its duties, the Commission, any member thereof, or any committee appointed thereby, may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony as the Commission, or such member or committee, may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before such member or committee.

(b) Sections 9 and 10 of the act entitled "An act to create a Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes," approved September 26, 1914 (38 Stat. 722; 15 U. S. C. 49-50), relating to access to information, the attendance of witnesses, and the production of documentary evidence, shall be applicable to any investigation or hearing conducted by or under authority of the Commission to the same extent and with the same effect as if such investigation or hearing were conducted by the Federal Trade Commission.

(c) The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The Commission may also procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals.

(d) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, section 412 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99), or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connec-

tion with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

SEC. 6. (a) The members of the Commission who are Members of the Congress shall serve without additional compensation. The members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve without additional compensation, but shall continue to receive the salary of their regular position when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. All other members of the Commission shall receive \$50 per diem when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) All members of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

EXPENSES

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this act.

EXPIRATION

SEC. 8. The Commission shall cease to exist 30 days after the submission of the report provided for in section 4 (b).

The explanatory statement by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

The Congress has in recent years spent a good deal of time and effort in investigating campaign expenditures. The fact that these investigations have taken place certainly shows that there is considerable dissatisfaction with the present statutes governing campaign expenditures. Yet, so far, no new legislation has resulted from the studies which have been made.

I think there are some good reasons why we have not been able to get new legislation to deal with this problem. One is the extreme complexity of the problem, and the difficulty—despite the time and effort spent—in gathering reliable data and information on the sources, purposes, and extent of campaign expenditures. Another reason is the fact that public opinion has not been focused on the problem, so that there has not been much pressure for legislation, except from people who are professionally concerned with politics, either as practicing politicians, or as students of government and politics.

Meanwhile, the problem has become ever more pressing. The mounting costs of television in recent political campaigns has brought about concern lest only the wealthy—or those who have the support of wealth—could afford to represent their fellow Americans in national office. Certainly, if such a situation should occur, it would endanger our democratic system of government. Majority rule is seriously reduced in meaning and effectiveness if the voters' choice lies only between men of wealth. Democracy requires that all men should be eligible to representative positions in government. A reasonable and stable political system will choose its representatives on other grounds than wealth alone.

Because the problem of campaign expenditures has not yet been solved, and because there is considerable dissatisfaction with our present provisions regulating the financing of political campaigns, I am today introducing a resolution which I hope will lead to progress in solving this difficult problem of our American democracy. I am proposing that a commission be created to give the problem thorough study, and to recommend legislation to the Congress to deal with the problem. I believe that such a commission might meet the two difficulties I alluded to earlier. It would have the staff and the jurisdiction to enable it to do a thorough job of research. And, if well-known and re-

spected men in both public and private life were appointed to it, the commission could help to focus public attention on this problem.

I think it is very probable that some new legislation is needed in the field of campaign financing. Yet I do not believe we should rush ahead with legislation until the problem has had more study than it has had so far. There are still a number of aspects of the problem on which the Congress has very little information.

There are a number of loopholes in the present statutes. The Federal Corrupt Practices Act does not extend to primary elections. Yet vast sums of money are often spent in these elections, and in some parts of the country these elections are the most important ones.

The present statutes do not apply to intra-state political committees and organizations—even where these committees are supporting candidates for Federal office. Thus, a large part of the financing of political campaigns for Federal offices is not subject to regulation.

The present limitations on expenditures by candidates are rather unrealistic, and they are evaded by various means which violate the spirit, if not the letter, of the statutes. Moreover, the constantly mounting costs of radio and TV campaigning are making this problem more difficult all the time.

Various rulings of the courts have made the position of many private organizations unclear, in their relation to political campaigns. Sound public policy requires that these provisions be clarified.

Finally, nobody really has any idea how much money is actually spent in campaigns for Federal offices. Present requirements for publicity and reporting of expenses do not cover enough of these expenses to give us this vital information. Yet we ought to know more about this before proceeding to legislate, or even before we decide whether or not legislation is needed.

These are just a few of the most outstanding problems in connection with the present statutes. There are a number of other and subsidiary problems. If it should be decided that new legislation is required, then there will be extreme difficulties in working out statutes which hold both to the spirit and the letter of the Constitution, and at the same time are realistic, adequate and unambiguous.

It is my belief that this is a job for a high-level commission. The commission should contain representatives from both public office and private life. It should be composed of men and women who have shown real concern with the problems of good government and of democracy.

I do not believe that we can rid Government of corruption and inefficiency until we make sure that our methods of electing people to office are above reproach. It is in the interest of efficient government in a more public-spirited democracy that I introduce this resolution.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Natural Resources. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution, together with a statement by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 108) to establish a Joint Committee on Natural Resources, introduced by Mr. HUM-

PHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That (a) there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Natural Resources (hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee") to be composed of 8 Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate, and 8 Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker. In each instance not more than 4 members shall be members of the same political party. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to perform the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and vice chairman from among its members.

(b) The members of the joint committee shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the functions vested in the joint committee, other than expenses in connection with meetings of the joint committee held in the District of Columbia during such times as the Congress is in session.

SEC. 2. The joint committee shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts and consultants and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman of the joint committee. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Clerk of the House of Representatives out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the Senate in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

SEC. 4. (a) It shall be the duty of the joint committee—

(1) to investigate the operations and effects of all Federal statutes dealing with the natural resources of the United States;

(2) to investigate the administration of such statutes by the executive departments, boards, bureaus, agencies, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the Government charged with their administration; and

(3) to make such other investigations with respect to the conservation of the natural resources of the United States as the joint committee may deem necessary.

(b) The joint committee shall make reports to the Senate and House of Representatives, from time to time, concerning the results of its investigations together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

(c) The functions vested in the joint committee by this resolution are supplemental to the functions vested in other committees (including joint committees) of Congress; and nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed so as to curtail or take away any function of any such committee.

SEC. 5. (a) The joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony, and to procure such printing and binding, as it deems advisable.

(b) (1) The joint committee is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, board, bureau, agency, independent establishment or instrumentality of the Government, information, suggestions, data, estimates, and statistics which will be of

assistance to the joint committee in carrying out its functions under this joint resolution.

(2) The executive departments, boards, bureaus, agencies, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the Government are authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, data, estimates, and statistics directly to the joint committee upon request made pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection.

The statement by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

The joint resolution provides for establishing a Joint Committee on Natural Resources by the Senate and House of Representatives.

The American people are quite properly concerned over indications that we, as a Nation, may be slipping backward from some of the great conservation policies established since the day of President Theodore Roosevelt.

Much of our Nation's strength and progress has been made possible by our abundance of great natural resources—land, water, timber, oil, and minerals—and the wisdom with which we have developed and used them.

But we have long ago learned the dangers of exploiting and wasting these valuable resources.

We know they are not unlimited. We know that they must be carefully safeguarded from exhaustion.

We have seen what happened down through history to other civilizations, when they exploited their resources beyond replenishment.

We cannot let that happen in our country.

We have tried to make certain it will not happen, as a matter of public policy.

For years we have responded to the will of the people by establishing safeguards over the uses of these resources, and sought to protect them for future generations to share.

Yet short-sighted pressures still exist for raids on these great national treasures. There are those who would be willing to exploit them for whatever immediate profit they could obtain, regardless of the consequences in the future.

We have seen those forces at work in virtually every field of natural resources; we have seen develop a growing demand for an abrupt turn-about in public policy that would cause Gifford Pinchot to roll over in his grave.

Now, if ever before, we need a strong revival of a crusading spirit for the protection of our vast forests; for protection and proper development of our water resources; for protection of our soil fertility on our farms; for the safeguarding of our petroleum resources.

We need firm national conservation policies, embracing all forms of natural resources, and putting foremost the public's stake in preservation of such resources for useful purposes in generations to come.

One of our great weaknesses in development of national conservation policies has been the multitude of agencies and groups concerned with different phases of the conservation problem.

We have conservation responsibilities and problems in the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Interior, the Department of Commerce, the Army engineers.

We have conservation policies being passed upon in various forms by the Senate Committees on Agriculture and Forestry, on Interior and Insular Affairs, and on Public Works.

Often we in the legislative branch of government have protested and objected to overlapping or duplicating authorities in the executive branch; we have also protested lack of effective coordination where divided responsibility exists.

Perhaps we should put our own house in order.

There seem to be sound grounds for creation of a Joint Committee on Natural Resources between the Senate and the House of Representatives as this resolution proposes—a bipartisan joint committee.

It would be a "watchdog committee," to help develop sound, coordinated national conservation policies, and safeguard the execution of those policies.

It is not the purpose of the resolution to interfere with or curtail existing functions of any congressional committees with reference to conservation of natural resources; rather it would create supplemental functions that should be helpful to all of the existing committees.

The purpose of the joint committee would be to investigate the operations and effects of all Federal statutes dealing with natural resources, to investigate the administration of such statutes by the executive departments, boards, bureaus, agencies, independent establishments and instrumentalities of the Government charged with their administration, and to make such other investigations with respect to conservation of natural resources as the joint committee shall deem necessary.

The committee shall be required to make reports to the Senate and House from time to time concerning the results of its investigations, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

The resolution calls for a Joint Committee on Natural Resources consisting of 16 Members, 8 from each of the 2 Houses of Congress, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, with not more than 8 of the Members being from any 1 political party. The committee will select its own chairman.

By creating such a committee, Congress will be protecting the interests of all the American people in safeguarding our valuable natural resources. It will be rejecting the pressures of giveaway raids, and reaffirming the traditional American policy of protecting its natural resources for the benefit of all the people rather than permit them to be exploited for the private profit of the few with special privilege and influence.

A similar resolution has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Mr. HELLER. It is a call to protect the public's interest that should not be ignored. It is an opportunity to aid, not raid, our natural resources. I want to commend and thank Congressman HELLER for his activity in behalf of this measure.

STATE OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution relating to the public debt. The concurrent resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the public debt has reached an amount close to the public debt limit as set by action of the Congress; and

Whereas an exceeding of such statutory public debt limit would cause the value of Government obligations and money to decline, and would reflect seriously upon the integrity of the American economy; and

Whereas it is difficult to ascertain the exact amount of the public debt to any instant so that it may be possible, though inadvertently, to issue Government obligations in excess of the statutory public-debt limit unless great care is exercised to prevent such violation of law: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that (1) the public debt does not exceed the statutory limit of \$275 billion; and (2) the heads of various departments and agencies in the executive branch of government take such action as may be necessary to keep the rate of ex-

penditures during the current fiscal year below the danger point where any inadvertent exceeding of the statutory debt limit may occur; and (3) the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to exercise such close supervision over public-debt transactions as to preclude the possibility of such violation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 49), submitted by Mr. MALONE, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

JURISDICTION OF CRIMINAL OFFENSES AND CIVIL CAUSES OF ACTION COMMITTED OR ARISING ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1063) to confer jurisdiction on the States of California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, and Wisconsin, with respect to criminal offenses and civil causes of action committed or arising on Indian reservations with such States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

TEMPORARY PROGRAM OF ASSISTANCE IN CONSTRUCTION OF MINIMUM SCHOOL FACILITIES IN CERTAIN AREAS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6049) to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, to provide a temporary program of assistance in the construction of minimum school facilities in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRINTING OF COMPILATION ENTITLED "THE UNITED STATES AND THE KOREAN SITUATION: DOCUMENTS 1943-1953"

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, events in Korea have reached a climax. A truce has finally been achieved through our patient efforts. During the next few months our energies will be directed toward arriving at a satisfactory settlement of the Korean problem. With this in mind, the Committee on Foreign Relations has directed its staff to compile for the Senate the important documents relating to the events in Korea, beginning with the Big Three decision at Cairo in 1943 that Korea shall be free and independent and ending with the present developments in the Panmunjom discussions. This collection should be highly useful to Senators in any discussion of the Korean settlement. I therefore ask permission of the Senate to have the compilation entitled "The United States and the Korean Situation: Documents 1943-1953" printed as a Senate document, after the Senate adjourns. While I do not know exactly how many pages it will be, it will probably run between 60 and 90 pages.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, additional editorials, articles, and so forth, were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

Editorial comment on House bill 4023, the so-called stockman's bill.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Editorials from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune, the Baltimore Sun, and the New York Herald Tribune, relative to rules proposed by Senator DOUGLAS for congressional investigating committees.

By Mr. JACKSON:

Editorial entitled "What Has It Accomplished?" published in the Christian Science Monitor of July 28, 1953, referring to the war in Korea.

By Mr. WILEY:

Correspondence dealing with restrictions on the treaty-making power of the President, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,
The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:
Rocco C. Scilliano, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor; and

Raymond J. Kelly, of Michigan, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 28, 1957, vice William J. Kennedy, resigned.

By Mr. CAPEHART, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Walter W. McAllister, of Texas, to be a member of the Home Loan Bank Board, vice Kenneth G. Heisler, term expired;

Victor E. Cooley, of Missouri, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization;

Glen E. Edgerton, of the District of Columbia, to be Managing Director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington;

Lynn U. Stambaugh, of North Dakota, to be Deputy Director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington; and

William D. Mitchell, of Colorado, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

William J. Donovan, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Thailand;

Lester D. Mallory, of Washington, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan;

Eric A. Johnston, of Washington, to be Chairman of the International Development Advisory Board;

Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be a representative to the eighth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1953;

James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, to be a representative to the eighth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1953;

Mrs. Frances Payne Bolton, of Ohio, to be a representative to the eighth session of the

General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1953;

James P. Richards, of South Carolina, to be a representative to the eighth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1953;

Archibald J. Carey, Jr., of Illinois, to be an alternate representative to the eighth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1953;

James David Zellerbach, of California, to be an alternate representative to the eighth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1953;

Henry Ford II, of Michigan, to be an alternate representative to the eighth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1953;

Dr. Charles W. Mayo, of Minnesota, to be an alternate representative to the eighth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1953;

Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, of New York, to be an alternate representative to the eighth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1953;

Theodore C. Achilles, and sundry other persons for appointment and promotion in the Foreign Service.

By Mr. IVES, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Arthur F. Burns, of New York, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

Frank A. Thornton, of California, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 25, with headquarters at San Diego, Calif.;

William N. Kerfoot, of Minnesota, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 36, with headquarters at Duluth, Minn.;

Olivia C. Erpenbach, of Minnesota, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 35, with headquarters at Minneapolis, Minn.;

Louis V. Dorp, of Pennsylvania, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 11, with headquarters at Philadelphia, Pa.;

Harry Edwards, of New York, to be surveyor of customs in customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y.;

Charles E. Dusenberry, of New York, to be Superintendent of the United States Assay Office of New York, N. Y.;

Chester Scott Keefer, of Massachusetts, to be Special Assistant on Health and Medical Affairs to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

Walter R. Schreiber, of Maryland, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

James L. Guilmartin, of Florida, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Florida;

Harry P. Cain, of Washington, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, for a term of 3 years, expiring August 9, 1956 (reappointment); and

Benjamin Cornwell Dawkins, Jr., of Louisiana, to be United States district judge for the western district of Louisiana.

By Mr. JACKSON (for Mr. LANGER), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William B. Bantz, of Washington, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Washington.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Pervie Lee Dodd, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Alabama;

Paul Johnson, of Oklahoma, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Oklahoma; and

James Y. Victor, of Oklahoma, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Oklahoma.

By Mr. KUCHEL (for Mr. LANGER), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

James A. Johnston, of California, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1953.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Richard A. Chappell, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1954.

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Scovel Richardson, of Missouri, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1956;

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

George Glenn Killinger, of Virginia, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1954;

George J. Reed, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1958; and

Harlan Hobart Grooms, of Alabama, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Alabama, vice Clarence Mullins, retired.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for Mr. LANGER), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Oliver D. Hamlin, Jr., of California, to be United States district judge for the northern district of California, vice Herbert W. Erskine, deceased.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Frank M. Johnson, Jr., of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Alabama.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Paul Wilbur Tappan, of New Jersey, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1956; and

Mrs. Robert W. Leeds (Daphne Robert), of New Jersey, for the position of Assistant Commissioner of Patents.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

George Templar, of Kansas, to be United States attorney for the district of Kansas.

By Mr. BRICKER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Seaborn Lee Digby, of Louisiana, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission, vice Harrington Wimberly, term expired; and Jack D. Walker, for permanent appointment as ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for Mr. LANGER), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Peter Mills, of Maine, to be United States attorney for the district of Maine, vice Alton A. Lessard, resigned.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for Mr. LANGER), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Charles P. Moriarty, of Washington, to be United States attorney for the western district of Washington, vice J. Charles Dennis, retired.

By Mr. PAYNE (for Mr. LANGER), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Harry W. Pinkham, of Maine, to be United States marshal for the district of Maine, vice Thomas N. Curran, term expired.

By Mr. CASE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Robert M. Weston, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, vice Kenneth W. Spencer, resigned.

By Mr. COOPER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Kenneth H. Tuggle, of Kentucky, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner, vice Walter M. W. Splawn, retired.

NOMINATION OF DOROTHY McCULLOUGH LEE TO BE MEMBER OF BOARD OF PAROLE—EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as in executive session, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I am very proud and happy to report favorably from that committee the nomination of Dorothy McCullough Lee, of Portland, Oreg., a former member of the Oregon State Legislature and some years ago a colleague of mine on the Oregon Crime Commission, to be a member of the Federal Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1958.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

RECESS TO 10 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, July 31, 1953, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 30 (legislative day of July 27), 1953:

UNITED NATIONS

Arthur Z. Gardiner, of Virginia, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Advisory Commission of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, vice Edwin A. Locke, Jr., resigned.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Samuel C. Waugh, of Nebraska, to be United States alternate governor of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, for a term of 5 years.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

John Williams Gwynne, of Iowa, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of 7 years from September 26, 1953, vice Stephen J. Spingarn, term expiring.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

William D. Mitchell, of Colorado, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Theodore C. Streibert, of New York, to be Director of the United States Information Agency, a position provided for in Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953, effective on the date upon which the said reorganization plan becomes effective.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Peter Auburn Richmond, of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the western district of Virginia, vice Leland S. Finney, resigning.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

W. Rae Dempsey, Jr., of Maryland, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 13, with headquarters at Baltimore, Md.

James L. Latimer, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 21, with headquarters at Port Arthur, Tex.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Wilson D. Leggett, Jr., United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of

Ships in the Department of the Navy, for a term of 4 years.

Rear Adm. Edward W. Clepton, United States Navy, to be Director of Budget and Reports in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 3 years.

The following-named officers of the line of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Hyman G. Rickover	Thomas Burrowes
Edward W. Clepton	Donald C. Varian
Edwin T. Layton	Albert E. Jarrell
Chester C. Smith	William G. Beecher, Jr.
Harold O. Larson	Charles H. Lyman 3d

The following-named officer of the Medical Service Corps of the Navy for permanent appointment in the line, with the grade of ensign:

Maurice Leenay

The following-named officer of the line of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James P. McCarthy, Jr.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 30 (legislative day of July 27), 1953:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

James W. Riddleberger, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Yugoslavia.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Charles Sparks Thomas, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Donald Aubrey Quarles, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Phil Ray Rodgers, of Maryland, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years expiring August 27, 1958.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

Edwin R. Price, of Kentucky, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review for a term expiring July 15, 1956.

Charles R. Ferguson, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review for a term expiring July 15, 1954.

IN THE ARMY

Lt. Gen. Charles Lawrence Bolté, O6908, for appointment as commander in chief, United States Army, Europe, with the rank of general, and as general in the Army of the United States.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Edwin Luther Sibert, O11193.
Brig. Gen. Robert Wesley Colglazier, Jr., O223635.

Brig. Gen. Gordon Byrom Rogers, O15620.
Brig. Gen. Philip DeWitt Ginder, O16904.
Brig. Gen. Lionel Charles McGarr, O17225.
Brig. Gen. Paul Donal Harkins, O17625.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Richard Gray McKee, O11217.
Col. Joseph Conrad Odell, O12439.
Col. Paschal Neilson Strong, O14904.
Col. Emerson Charles Itschner, O15516.
Col. Vonna Fernleigh Burger, O15667.
Col. Henry Randolph Westphaling, O16130.

Col. David Louis Van Syckle, O16425.
Col. John Bruce Medaris, O39554.
Col. Ralph Joseph Butchers, O17242.
Col. Alfred Benjamin Denniston, O17315.
Col. Edwin Hugh John Carns, O17560.
Col. William Arnold Carter, Jr., O18023.
Col. August Schomburg, O18422.
Col. Harvey Herman Fischer, O18832.

Col. Teddy Hollis Sanford, O29893.

Col. Paul Thomas Carroll, O19146.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified:

To be captains

Samuel M. Allen, MC, O992848.
Albert C. Donohoo, MC, O981308.
Burno Eisen, MC, O987804.
Henry A. Essex, MC, O379342.
William M. Gilmore, Jr., MC, O1922082.
Irvin M. Kent, JAGC, O432816.
John J. Kovacic, MC, O987290.
Joseph G. Lopez, MC, O991165.
Peter B. Macomber, MC, O2201319.
Robert E. Nitz, MC, O2203547.
Glenn A. West, MC, O1918617.

To be first lieutenants

Adam E. Adams, MSC, O1333581.
Wallace L. Anthony, VC, O993829.
Wilber H. Arnerberg, MSC, O451903.
John W. Barr, MSC, O2046884.
Heinz Bauer, MC.
Richard E. Bentley, MSC, O1699975.
Rodney S. Billett, VC, O1726917.
Roger R. Blisson, MSC, A1535131.
Walter D. Braun, JAGC, O1178079.
Leland B. Carter, VC, O47897.
Ernest D. Chadbourne, MSC, O449344.
Marshall W. Clapp, MSC, O966218.
Milton Cohen, MSC, O1543934.
Rennie C. Coleman, Jr., MSC, O2020626.
Jack Cross, MSC, A1341753.
Jack H. Crouch, JAGC, O1598349.
James D. Davenport, Jr., MSC, O443143.
Louis F. Davidson, MSC, A1543985.
Jack W. Downing, MSC, O1542624.
William H. Duvall, MSC, O1322532.
Walter F. Erne, MSC, O1543100.
Earl D. Ess, MSC, O963562.
Thomas S. Evisizer, Jr., MC, O2103384.
William A. Faulkner, VC, O1918520.
Glade F. Flake, JAGC, O2036858.
William J. Foulk, MSC, O957261.
Jerry E. Fries, VC, O1755559.
Floris M. Garner, VC, O1290740.
Harold S. Gillespie, MSC, O2208102.
Alan Hareus, MSC, O546619.
Cecil H. Hayes, MSC, O1703914.
William H. Hayes, MSC, O1533339.
Chester T. Hino, MSC, O1545562.
LaRay D. Hooker, MSC, O2048017.
Ernest O. Jones, MSC, O2014243.
Walter J. Keane, MSC, O2210195.
Donald L. Larnard, MSC, O953940.
William H. Lindsey, MSC, O1542657.
Henry E. Lord, MSC, O2051235.
Charles F. McAleer, Jr., MSC, O454016.
James E. McArthur, MSC, O2007645.
Wayne J. Moe, MSC, O1285474.
Robert W. Montgomery, DC, O2264108.
James E. Moore, MSC, O556568.
William S. Mullins, MSC, O1542640.
Wiley E. Oliver, JAGC, O1332299.
Albert E. Parker, MSC, O1996803.
William C. Pasternak, DC, O981010.
Michael J. Pavlo, Jr., MSC, O2046779.
Theodore S. Pendrak, MSC, O1690929.
John A. Postle, MSC, O949215.
Winston K. Powell, MSC, O1545597.
Gilbert L. Raulston, VC, O990292.
William E. Rothe, VC, O1545499.
Grayson Smith, MSC, O1543537.
Robert A. Stone, MSC, O1542133.
Charles W. Summers, DC, O980580.
Charles F. Sumner III, DC, O992010.
Alfred C. Waldrep, DC, O937739.
Charles L. Wittliff, MSC, O2049939.
James B. Young, VC, O1775775.

To be second lieutenants

Charles R. Angel, MSC, O976860.
John W. Arnold, MSC, O2102805.
Albert G. Benson, MSC, O995830.
Robert E. Bolger, MSC, O993055.
Duke C. Bradford, Jr., MSC, O992817.
Edward J. Carmick, MSC, O2048243.
Francis J. Carmody, Jr., MSC, O990676.
Donald C. Carroll, MSC, O996461.
Claudius D. Chewing, MSC, O2013963.
John P. Crawford, MSC, O989633.

Hugh F. Daly, Jr., MSC, O98742.
 Stephen P. Dittmann, MSC, O962997.
 William L. Freeman, MSC, O1917592.
 Kenneth D. Garis, MSC, O975309.
 Robert T. Geyer, MSC, O2048924.
 Henry V. Griffith, MSC, O2047673.
 Donald P. Guenther, MSC, O996881.
 Charles R. Hamm, MSC, O26648.
 Dan H. Horton, MSC, O555403.
 Joseph I. Hungate, Jr., MSC, O201237.
 Joseph P. Jacobs, MSC, O971756.
 Edward F. Krise, MSC, O997586.
 Robert J. MacLennan, MSC, O995827.
 Joseph P. Madrano, MSC, O672152.
 John D. Marshall, Jr., MSC, O2013868.
 Gust H. Masticola, MSC, O962993.
 Marjory R. McBride, ANC, N804708.
 Robert W. McKinney, MSC, O969205.
 Raymond K. Mortenson, MSC, O517385.
 Roy L. Mundy, MSC, O2047083.
 Wallace P. Murdoch, MSC, O995592.
 George T. Murray, Jr., MSC, O967039.
 Herman C. Needles, MSC, O1533875.
 John F. Purcell, MSC, O992955.
 Jack C. Smith, MSC, O949851.
 William G. Storms, MSC, O995678.
 Tommy Thomas, MSC.
 John P. Valentine, MSC, O2047888.
 John R. Wagner, MSC, O967337.
 Paul B. Welch, Jr., MSC, O554172.
 Robert O. Whitmore, MSC, O1547852.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade indicated:

To be first lieutenants

Eric I. Anderson, O1928874.
 James L. Breen, O2263881.
 Stephen W. Czarnecki, O1893357.
 Maurice G. Patton, O347623.
 James A. Stokes, O1892442.

The following-named persons for appointment as chaplains of the Regular Army, in the grade indicated:

To be first lieutenants

Earl S. Bloxham, O389156.
 James V. Coleman, O1290378.
 Woodrow L. Elias, O926099.
 Thomas H. McCarthy, O981392.
 Ben S. Price, O1176165.
 Ray M. Rowland, O931833.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade indicated:

To be second lieutenants

Robert E. Ainslie, John J. Miller, O1926766.
 Thurman E. Anderson, O4011606.
 William L. Baddaker, William C. Moses.
 Robert E. Bellows, Edmund R. Nollin.
 Charles E. Brett, Richard L. Pardun, O1928930.
 Charles W. Brown, John T. Patton.
 O1880869, John H. Pearson, O968253.
 Elmer A. Brown, John J. Plunkett, O1893189.
 Horatio S. Buck, Jr., O1935326.
 James P. Coleman, Charles R. Rawlings.
 Charles F. DeWaele, Frank J. Riley.
 O1872706, Roberto Rivera.
 Eugene C. Dickey, Jr., James B. Robinson, Jr.
 Howard H. Earle, Robert F. Rogers.
 O1937020, Herman E. Schubarth.
 Lee N. Elmer, O1924929.
 O2265384, Eckols L. Shedden.
 William H. Fargason, Bill J. Smith.
 Jr., Perry A. Smith.
 William C. Francis, James I. Sprague, Jr.
 Albert Q. Hales, Jr., Lawrence W. Stebbins.
 O1891247, John D. Talley, Jr.
 Charles N. Hauser, Elmer B. Tripp, O1876326.
 O2021728, Henry G. Tutek.
 John M. Hays, Larkin B. Vance, O1935090.
 William E. Henderson, Ralph E. Wallingford.
 O1891890, Robert L. Wilcox, Jr., O1886869.
 Adolph A. Hight, Robert L. Young.
 Harold W. Hill, Jr., William K. Zimmerman.
 Harvey D. Jordan, O971880.
 Jack E. McCroskey.
 Harry W. Miller II, O1877632.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade indicated:

To be second lieutenants

Lloyd K. Austin.
 Kenneth B. Jones.
 James F. Walker.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade indicated:

To be second lieutenants

Robert E. Barnum, Frank J. Kane.
 O1887386, Felton A. Kemp,
 George B. Bengston, Jr. O1887907.
 John P. Brock, Everett F. Kofoed,
 O1887977, O1927406.
 William M. Bryan, Charles H. Kratsch.
 Richard A. Burr, Humberto C. Lopez.
 David L. Butler, Jerry H. Loyd.
 Craig W. Chapleau, Francis X. Marotta.
 O2104231, Joseph O. Massey, Jr.
 Alfred B. Colson, Jr., Moran A. McKenzie.
 Robert C. Cook, Jr., James D. McManus,
 Charles L. Coughlin, O1928051.
 Doyle T. Craighead, Carl M. Mott, Jr.
 O1880534, John D. Murdaugh.
 Bruce E. Dahl, Richard D. Neal.
 Jules L. Davidson, Jr., Lamoin A. Olsen.
 Hal A. Davis, Dan P. Panageas.
 Norris F. Dendy, Jr., Paul T. Pass.
 William H. Edwards, Samuel W. Penrod.
 Stephen N. Elias, Donald A. Pies.
 Khalil C. Farah, Jr., Dan H. Ralls.
 Richard L. Ford, Donald P. Rathnau.
 Lawrence J. Franck, John S. Schlom.
 John L. Garcia, Harold M. Serven, Jr.
 Ralph L. Gardner, Gene T. Sherron.
 Kenton C. Gassaway, Paul E. Sikorski.
 O1915878, Robert M. Stone,
 Robert F. Geringer, O1928072.
 William R. Gleason, Clifford H. Wall.
 Jr., Joe C. Wallace.
 Edward M. Griffin, Norman F. Weatherly.
 Melton A. Hatch, Jr., Richard B. Werner.
 Joseph Hrecz, Dwight L. Wilson.
 Paul B. Jones, Oren Wolfe.
 Robert P. Jones, Clyde A. Young, Jr.

REGULAR AIR FORCE

PROMOTION

To be captain, medical

Wilbert Harding McIlvain, 24662A.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Charles W. Fox, Supply Corps, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

Rear Adm. John E. Gingrich, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Chief of Naval Material.

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for permanent appointment in the grade indicated in the Naval Reserve:

To be rear admiral, line

Ellery Wheeler Stone.
 Giles Chester Stedman.
 Luis de Florez.
 Lewis Lichtenstein Strauss.
 Edmond Joseph Moran.

To be rear admiral, Supply Corps

Wilfred James McNeil.
 The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for temporary promotion to the grade in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to the prescribed qualifications:

To be rear admiral, line

William R. Read, Edward C. Holden, Jr.
 Richard R. McNulty, William W. Drake.
 Karl L. Lange, Charles L. Labarge.
 James Morton Ross, Harry P. Stolz.

To be rear admiral, Medical Corps, line

Richard A. Kern.
 Alphonse McMahon.

To be rear admiral, Civil Engineer Corps, line

Robert C. Johnson

The following-named ensigns of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade in the line and staff corps indicated:

To be lieutenants (junior grade), line

Paul Allison, Edwin D. McKellar, Jr.
 Gerald H. Barkalow, William G. McLaine.
 James H. Bergstrom, Robert L. Nelson.
 William B. Bickel, Theodore E. Newark.
 James E. Bowen, Emile E. Nordan.
 Thomas L. Bowers, Stephen R. Odrobina.
 William J. Burke, Forrest C. Ozburn, Jr.
 Charles L. Bush, Carroll S. Page, Jr.
 Terry F. Carraway, Jerry C. Patterson.
 Hamilton A. Chandler, Lyle R. Peters.
 Frank S. Coleman, Eugene H. Prange.
 Carleton R. Cooper, Thomas B. Ray.
 Eugene R. Coulson, Robert R. Reynier.
 Thomas R. Cuthbert, Jr., Clay S. Sayers.
 James L. Ellis, John J. Scheank, Jr.
 Ralph W. Foster, Jr., Leroy E. Souders.
 John C. Glone, Gregory W. Stanley.
 Richard W. Green, Thomas P. Stewart.
 Roy E. Grozier, Charles L. Stratmann.
 Russell L. Harber, Alexander S. Stromski.
 David L. Hardin, Keith K. Stroupe.
 Carl O. Hausler, Herbert A. Sudhoff.
 Carl C. Hilscher, Lonnie D. Tension.
 Dari W. Jewell, Alan D. Tibbetts.
 Alfred C. Leis, William A. Wehner.
 Robert T. Lemon, William H. Wells.
 Sidney R. Mason, Richard A. Wigent.
 Paul G. Merchant, Donald B. Wikeen.
 Harold E. McCumber.

To be lieutenant (junior grade) Supply Corps

Robert B. Graham.
 John A. Wasson.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate July 30 (legislative day of July 27), 1953:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Argentina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 30, 1953

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

I hereby designate the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who wert the God of our fathers and hast made us a nation great in material resources, may our prosperity and progress never cause us to lose sight of the need of building our Republic upon moral and spiritual foundations.

We pray that we may cultivate a capacity for utilizing and rightly interpreting the history and experiences of other nations and preceding generations which teach us that where there is no vision the people perish.